

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

Tolson _____
Sullivan _____
Mohr _____
Bishop _____
Brennan, C.D. _____
Callahan _____
Casper _____
Conrad _____
Dalbey _____
Felt _____
Gale _____
Rosen _____
Tavel _____
Walters _____
Soyars _____
Tele. Room _____
Holmes _____
Gandy _____

TO : Mr. Bishop

DATE: 5/24/71

FROM : M. A. Jones

SUBJECT: "WE BAND OF BROTHERS"
A MEMOIR OF ROBERT F. KENNEDY
BOOK REVIEW

SYNOPSIS:

Guthman's book is published by Harper and Row, Publishers, and is a 330-page "hatchet job" designed to glorify former Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy at the expense of the Director and the Bureau. The book is replete with references both to Mr. Hoover and the FBI, some of which are favorable, most of which are neutral, and many of which are critical either intrinsically or by innuendo. As a forecast of things to come, Guthman states in his "Author's Note" that his book does not purport to be an objective analysis. This candid insight is well borne out by his subsequent chapters.

No pertinent references to the Director or the Bureau, other than asides, are found in the first five chapters. The author subsequently claims the Director "urged" Kennedy to become Attorney General and alludes that solely as a result of Kennedy's intervention the number of black Special Agents employed by the FBI was substantially increased. In chapter 9 he alleges again by innuendo that although the FBI had information that the Freedom Riders in Alabama would be attacked by the Ku Klux Klan we withheld this information from the Department and advised only the local authorities and as a result the Freedom Riders were attacked. The book also repeats a number of old canards relative to the FBI not investigating organized crime prior to the Kennedy Administration and reiterates the Kennedy "myth" concerning wire tapping.

The bulk of the criticism is found in chapter 12 entitled "Johnson and Hoover" which alleges the Director's Office leaked information to the press concerning former President Kennedy's assassination despite explicit instructions from the Department that the first assassination report was to be reviewed by the Warren Commission prior to disclosure, that Kennedy raised the morale of the FBI by visiting Field Offices, and relates what is obviously a fictional confrontation between the

Enclosure

1 - Mr. Sullivan
1 - Mr. Brennan

NOT RECORDED

1 - Mr. Mohr
1 - M. A. Jones

1 - Mr. Bishop

KPW:pjp (7)

CONTINUED - OVER

67 JUN 9 1971

ORIGINAL FILED IN 77-85663-1

M. A. Jones to Bishop memo
RE: "WE BAND OF BROTHERS"


Director and Ethel Kennedy wherein Mrs. Kennedy allegedly forces the Director to agree former Los Angeles Chief of Police Parker should replace him upon his retirement. The author's basic allegations relate to what he calls the "extreme coolness" with which the Director allegedly treated Kennedy immediately following the assassination of his brother.

RECOMMENDATION:

None. For the Director's information.

JCF 







M. A. Jones to Bishop memo
RE: "WE BAND OF BROTHERS"

DETAILS:

Edwin Guthman was formerly a "Seattle Times" newspaperman for 13 years. He won the Pulitzer prize in 1950 for national reporting. He was, of course, former Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy's Special Assistant for Public Information in the Department of Justice and also served as Kennedy's first Senatorial Press Secretary. At the present time he is national editor of the "Los Angeles Times," Los Angeles, California.

Chapters 1 through 5 consist of the author's description of his initial meeting with Robert Kennedy, Kennedy's subsequent activities as an investigator and/or counsel for Senators McCarthy and McClellan, the 1960 presidential campaign, and the subsequent election. There are no references to the Director, and the FBI is mentioned in these chapters only as a means of identifying other members of Kennedy's entourage as former FBI Agents. These men are former SA's Carmine S. Bellino, Francis Flanagan and the late James McInerney, none of whom are or were friends-of-the-Bureau.

In chapter 6 entitled "We Happy Few," Guthman stated that Kennedy was reluctant to accept the post as Attorney General because of possible criticism alleging nepotism and that he therefore sought advice from Senator McClellan, the Director, and Justice William O. Douglas. According to the author, McClellan and the Director "urged him to become Attorney General." Douglas suggested he look elsewhere for employment.

The next reference to the Bureau and the Director is found in the same chapter on page 104 where the author claims the FBI had less than a dozen black Special Agents "including two who served as attendants in Hoover's office-- out of a total of almost six thousand," at the time Kennedy became AG. A footnote states that ten years later based on Department of Justice employment figures the FBI had some 51 blacks among the total of 7,910 Special Agents.

Guthman states the Director asserted the FBI was having difficulty finding eligible young blacks and Kennedy advised his staff and U. S. Attorneys nationwide would provide the names of qualified blacks from their home areas. The author states, "The number of black FBI agents increased." No additional mention of the Bureau or the Director is made in the remainder of this chapter or chapter 7.

M. A. Jones to Bishop memo
RE: "WE BAND OF BROTHERS"

A number of references to the FBI relating to our Obstruction of Justice investigation of New York State Supreme Court Judge James Vincent Keogh are found in chapter 8. Guthman states John F. Malone, Special Agent in Charge (sic) of the FBI Office in New York, did not want to give the Judge a lie detector test and the Director supported Malone. After continued insistence by the AG, Guthman said the Director remarked, "Sherlock Holmeses must have their fun." Upon completion of the lie detector test which was inconclusive, Guthman said the Director noted, "See, that shows I was right."

In chapter 9 entitled "The Freedom Riders," Guthman reverts to his "backdoor" attacks by innuendo by stating a Klan informant advised the FBI in Alabama that the Freedom Riders' buses might be attacked and he acknowledges the Bureau alerted the Birmingham and Anniston, Alabama, Police. He states the Bureau did not, however, notify anybody in the Attorney General's Office and as a result no local officers were on hand to restrain the Klansmen and the mob beat the passengers for about ten minutes. The remainder of this chapter and chapter 10 are without pertinent references to the Bureau and the Director.

Chapter 11 contains the old canard of criticizing the Bureau for contacting newsmen at 5 o'clock in the morning during the steel crisis. Guthman states a meeting was held in the Department attended by himself, Kennedy and his staff, and former Assistant Director Courtney Evans. The decision to have the newsmen contacted was reached at approximately 6 p.m., April 11, 1962, but according to Guthman it was not until after midnight that this information was cleared through the FBI Office in Philadelphia. Guthman stated Kennedy took full responsibility and stated, "I get some credit when FBI agents do something good. I'll take the heat when they goof."

Chapter 12 is entitled "Johnson and Hoover" and contains the bulk of the criticism of the Director. Guthman states by way of introduction that when he came to the Department he had considerable respect for the Bureau and a good deal of high regard for the Director. However, after "...seeing Hoover at close range it was a revealing and ultimately embittering experience." He acknowledges that when he left the Department after almost four years his esteem for the men of the FBI and respect for the Bureau's capabilities were largely intact. The crux of Guthman's criticism relates to what he calls "the extreme coolness" with which the Director allegedly treated Kennedy immediately following the assassination of former President Kennedy.

M. A. Jones to Bishop memo
RE: "WE BAND OF BROTHERS"


Guthman alleged former Chief Justice Warren requested the FBI's first report on the investigation of the assassination not be made public until the Commission had examined it and that this request was made known to the Director by former Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach, but within a few hours the report had been leaked to several newsmen. He states all the indications were that it had been leaked by the Director's Office.

Guthman stated that during the early part of Kennedy's administration Kennedy defended the Director when there was public criticism of him, visited most of the FBI Field Offices and as a result "raised FBI morale and was highly respected by many agents." Guthman goes on to relate the old criticism that the Bureau had not engaged in investigation of organized crime prior to the Kennedy Administration and, of course, completely ignores the absence of FBI jurisdiction prior to enactment of appropriate criminal statutes by Congress. He also delves into the newspaper morgues in an attempt to resurrect the alleged innocence of the former Attorney General concerning wire tapping. Guthman alleges nothing which has not been previously categorically and absolutely refuted.

He does quote William G. Hundley, former head of the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Criminal Division, who states that when he asked the FBI about wire tapping and electronic bugs "...the top brass of the Bureau would flat-out lie to me."

The final shot taken by Guthman at the Director and the Bureau is found in a footnote on page 266 which relates an incident which allegedly occurred at a party wherein Ethel Kennedy, referring to former Los Angeles Chief of Police Parker, stated to the Director, "Don't you think Chief Parker is a wonderful man? Don't you think that if you ever retire he'd be the man to replace you?" Guthman goes on in his insidious manner to state the Director reddened and replied meekly, "Yes Ethel."

There are no further references to either the Director or the Bureau in this work which is notable for the absence of any correlation between truth and fiction.



UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : Mr. C. D. Brennan

FROM : A. W. Gray

SUBJECT: "WE BAND OF BROTHERS"
A MEMOIR OF ROBERT F. KENNEDY
BY EDWIN GUTHMAN
BOOK REVIEW

- 1 - Mr. F. P. Mohr
- 1 - Mr. W. C. Sullivan
- 1 - Mr. T. E. Bishop
- 1 - Mr. A. Rosen
- 1 - Mr. C. D. Brennan
- DATE: 5/27/71
- 1 - Mr. M. A. Jones
- 1 - Mr. A. W. Gray
- 1 - Mr. J. V. Walsh
- 1 - Mr. L. L. Anderson

Tolson _____
Sullivan _____
Mohr _____
DeLoach _____
Casper _____
Callahan _____
Conrad _____
Dalbey _____
Felt _____
Gale _____
Rosen _____
Tavel _____
Walters _____
Soyars _____
Tele. Room _____
Holmes _____
Gandy _____

Memorandum Jones to Bishop 5/24/71 reviewed captioned book wherein Guthman states that while the Department was aware of Freedom Ride of 1961 by Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), the information had not been brought to the Attorney General's attention prior to the eruption of violence 5/14/61. The FBI, however, had information that the Freedom Riders in Alabama would be attacked by the Klan, which information was furnished only to local authorities and not to the Department. As a result, the attack took place. The Director inquired "What are the facts of this allegation?"

BACKGROUND:

On 4/24/61, information was disseminated by Bureau to all offices with instructions to alert local authorities concerning the plans of the CORE, a Negro organization favoring integration, to conduct a "Freedom Ride 1961," reportedly to make a nonviolent attempt to complete integration of bus service in related public accommodations in the South. The group was to arrive in Birmingham, Alabama, 5/14/61. On 5/10-12-13/61 we received information that local authorities might allow disturbances to take place when the group arrived in Alabama and that the Klan intended to take violent action against the group when it arrived in a bus terminal in Birmingham 5/14/61. Memorandum Rosen to Parsons 5/13/61 stated, "We have alerted all authorities concerning the information furnished by our informant including the Chief of Police of Birmingham Police Department who is a National Academy graduate." From a review of our files we have been unable to locate any written record of dissemination of this data to the Department prior to 5/14/61.

LLA:co
(10)

NOT RECORDED

CONTINUED - OVER

184 JUN 9 1971

67 JUN 9 1971

ORIGINAL FILED IN 79-85663-38

Memorandum to Mr. Brennan
Re: "We Band of Brothers"
A Memoir of Robert F. Kennedy
by Edwin Guthman

No request was received from the Department for specific investigation concerning "Freedom Ride 1961" prior to the outbreak of violence and we were providing intelligence data to the Department as received. By letter 5/15/61, the Department was advised this Bureau was conducting investigation into the acts of violence which occurred in Alabama 5/14/61 and that information concerning possible violence had been furnished to Birmingham authorities prior to 5/14/61.

By letter 5/18/61, Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall acknowledged Bureau's intent to investigate captioned matter under character of "Racial Matters; Destruction of Aircraft and Motor Vehicle" and set forth nature and extent of Department's interest.

OBSERVATIONS:

These were fast moving occurrences and our primary concern at that time was to notify local authorities who could prevent violence. We did advise local authorities in time for them to prevent the attacks which took place, however, local authorities failed to take the necessary action.

RECOMMENDATION:

None. For the Director's information.

[Handwritten signatures and initials: J. Edgar Hoover, J. Lee, A. B., M. L., J. S., W. B. S.]

How to Do It

By BENNETT KREMEN

If revolutions were fought with books instead of bullets our cities would already be in ruins. And blood would be pouring through their gutters. Book racks everywhere are beginning to creak under an ever-increasing number of works devoted to the destruction of the existing order, well-packaged handbooks on how to annihilate the Establishment distributed by such giants of American capitalism as Random House and McGraw-Hill, in fact by almost all of commercial publishing.

Indeed, the spring list was dominated by books that would, if taken seriously, destroy the very publishers who've produced them. Dozens and dozens of these volumes are rolling off the presses of the major houses, some of them personal accounts of revolt and rebellion, others studies of campus insurrections, of black fury, of current revolutionary theory and history or of such diverse expressions of modern unrest as the so-called revolutionary front in the high schools, the political confrontations in our courts and a hint of mutiny in the army. Apparently wherever a defiant brick has been flung, an eager author is rushed to the spot—and here is a sampling of the results so far:

Have copy

DO IT! By Jerry Rubin. (Simon & Schuster. Cloth, \$5.95. Paper, \$2.45.) Staring from its cover is Rubin's war-painted face and surprisingly serious eyes—surprising because, after reading his mélange of revolutionary clichés ranted in the Yippie style mixed with political autobiography, erotica and “ain’t-I-naughty” slapstick, one can’t imagine anything about this headline-hungry media-hustler being taken seriously. Surely his impassioned call for more acid and less discipline would force any self-respecting revolutionary general in command to shoot him dead. Indeed after reading Rubin’s call for a return to some fantacized, carefree Xanadu, supposedly inherent in the tortured state of adolescence—all this in the name of Freedom and a better, more self-indulgent world—one just can’t imagine our cotton-candy rebel surviving the brutality of a true revolutionary struggle. Without the benefit of TV cameras to lift his spirits, it’s not hard to imagine Yippie leader Rubin withering on the first mile of Mao’s great march. Nonetheless, there is laughter to be gotten from some of the madcap tales in “Do It!” and for those who know revolution

BOOK REVIEWS

62-46855-A
NOT RECORDED
102 JUL 28 1970

*File in Review File
Book 62-46855
56 JUL 30 1970*

- Tolson
- DeLoach
- Walters
- Mohr
- Bishop
- Casper
- Callahan
- Conrad
- Felt
- Gale
- Rosen
- Sullivan
- Tavel
- Soyars
- Tele. Room
- Holmes
- Gandy

R. D. [Signature]

Mr. Kremen is a freelance writer living in New York.

Alta [Signature]

- The Washington Post Times Herald
- The Washington Daily News
- The Evening Star (Washington)
- The Sunday Star (Washington)
- Daily News (New York)
- Sunday News (New York)
- New York Post
- The New York Times 4
- The Sun (Baltimore)
- The Daily World
- The New Leader
- The Wall Street Journal
- The National Observer
- People's World
- Examiner (Washington)

Date JUL 12 1970

70-19-110

for the grim, bloody business it is, a healthy dose of horror at the naïveté and irresponsibility of some of those who've seized the revolutionary banner.

Have
REVOLUTION FOR THE HELL OF IT. By Abbie Hoffman. (Dial. Cloth, \$4.95. Paper, \$1.95.) **WOODSTOCK NATION.** A Talk-Rock Album. By Abbie Hoffman. (Random-Vintage. Cloth, \$5.95. Paper, \$2.95.) If Mao would have shot Rubin, he would no doubt have simply shipped Abbie Hoffman back to his mother. But Mao is a tough critic, a breed Abbie Hoffman seems uncannily able to avoid. These collections of pages he passes off as books should have been swiftly decimated by those responsible for the maintenance of literary standards. Perhaps Abbie's popularity as an alleged warrior for pure justice and his ability to manipulate the media, which he often boasts of in his scribbles, inhibited those who might have forced him to approach literature with that bit of awe necessary for this art to flourish. Instead, without thought, style or organization, we are given in both his books more egocentric political autobiography, Yippie slogans, revolution for the TV cameras and a dose of paranoia that reduces the complexities of politics, revolution and man himself into eerie, simplistic symbols of good and evil — this passion and distortion only a bane to a true revolution which depends for its very survival on a cool-headed appraisal of power and personality, of action and reaction. Nowhere in all the excitement of describing how Uncle Sam was baited in Chicago, at the Pentagon, in Woodstock does Hoffman ever really step out of his grandiose, mind-blown world to consider the terrors of counter-revolution.

FAMOUS LONG AGO. My Life and Hard Times with Liberation News Service. By Raymond Mungo. (Beacon. Cloth, \$6.95. Paper, \$2.95.) In this clearly written and appealingly naive autobiography, we accompany a young radical on a less arrogant and more classical search for a better world. Though his Holy Grail seemed to lie in meetings with the Vietcong in Czechoslovakia and with the Liberation News Service, which was set up to feed copy to underground newspapers, Mungo discovered that competition, political infighting and vicious factionalism reside not only on Capitol Hill but among his allies on the New Left also. Bruised from combat not with his enemies, but with his friends, he retreated to poetry, Rousseauian idealism and a Vermont commune where he now says: "We're only trying to change ourselves... what a preoccupation! But if we get better, if I get better, that's a tangible change, isn't it?"

Have
PICKING UP THE GUN. A Report on the Black Panthers. By Earl Anthony. (Dial. \$4.95) There is no retreat for Earl Anthony, even to the snows of Vermont, for his black skin affords this angry man no rest anywhere. He is totally dedicated to violence, if violence is called for, but only if it benefits the black man. For Anthony isn't concerned with class struggle, but with race. First and last, he remains a Black Nationalist only. Therefore his initial intoxication with the Black Panthers, which his book records in detail, ends in disappointment and his ultimate exclusion from their ranks. Ironically, we find at the end of his book that it is the Black Panthers' alliance (or is it integration?) with white radicals and their revolutionary Marxism that separated Anthony from this party he once so admired.

Have
SEIZE THE TIME. The Story of the Black Panther Party and Huey P. Newton. By Bobby Seale. (Random. \$6.95.) Old-fashioned notions such as villainy and virtue still live in this strangely Homeric book full of combat and heroism; described often with Biblical cadence in the simple, searing language of the streets. In this effectively impassioned manner, Seale makes it clear that the Panthers have adapted Marxist-Leninism to the black experience and are committed not only to the elevation of the black man but to a revolutionary world order. (To Seale, Chairman of the Black Panther Party, Earl Anthony is an ignominious "jackanapes" who misused the party's trust and misunderstands its noble calling.)

The startling power of Seale's book lies not in its politics but in its passion; not in its polemics but in his belief, despite our age of anti-heroes, in the Olympian act of courage. This is the stuff great myths once were made of, and in this autobiographical history, largely inspired by an unflinching awe and love for the Black Panther Party's young leader, Huey P. Newton, Seale has undoubtedly converted Newton into one of those viable mythical beings necessary to sustain any culture, politically and spiritually. Somewhere within us we must believe in courage, virtue and humanity or shiver in a sinister landscape alive only with vileness and distrust. When Seale describes gun-toting Huey challenging the City's men in blue to a duel-out in the streets of the ghetto, any man — to the Right or the Left — can only marvel at the beauty of his bravery.

Have
REVOLUTIONARY NOTES. By Julius Lester. (Grove-Evergreen-Black Cat. Paper, \$1.25.) These lean, piercing essays should sober many slogan-drunk members of the New Left and caution dreamers of revolution in the nation's black slums; for Lester says, "The revolutionary's concern is not to sound or be militant." His concern is to be realistic.

The revolutionary is very careful not to do anything that would call for a confrontation between him and the enemy as long as he knows he can't win that confrontation. The revolutionary does nothing that will serve only to unite the enemy against him." In essay after essay, Lester cuts like a surgeon into revolutionary strategy and principles, freeing them of the fantasy, bloated rhetoric and useless emotion characterizing so much of the sound and fury passing today as revolutionary action. Thus if revolution is your thing, Lester's realism should be your Baedeker. And for so many who feel that the current demonstrations and confrontations spell revolution just around the corner, these words from Lester should be reassuring or sobering: "A flower is a good weapon only when guns are not fired. A body is a good weapon only when the billy clubs are not swung with automated efficiency and tear gas used as if it were a squirt of nasal spray for head colds. It was a victory confronting the soldiers at the Pentagon with flower power only because the powerful did not use their power."

THE HIGH SCHOOL REVOLUTIONARIES. Edited by Marc Libarle and Tom Seligson. (Scanlan's-Random. \$6.95.) **OUR TIME IS NOW.** Notes from the High School Underground. Edited by John Birmingham. (Praeger. \$5.95.) Though our racial nightmare and cancerous Asian war add undeniable legitimacy to their sense of outrage, and even though such just grievances as tyrannical dress standards imposed in some schools or exploitative wages paid to janitorial personnel in others deserve a hearing from all of us, one can't help detecting also in some of the adolescent essayists who appear in these two books that ageless impulse simply to spitball the old teacher while her back's to the class

—this time executed under a red banner. And oh, how arrogantly self-righteous the yet unsullied young can be! Because of the humility and warmth perhaps of its young editor, there's less of this in "Our Time Is Now" than in "The High School Revolutionaries," where we hear it stridently and often from representatives of such oppressed areas as Scarsdale.

THE BATTLE FOR MORNINGSID
HEIGHTS. Why Students Rebel. By Roger Kahn. (Morrow. \$6.95.) **PUSH COMES TO SHOVE.** The Escalation of Student Protest. By Steve Kelman. (Houghton Mifflin. \$5.95.) Though the high schoolers insist that they are strictly doing their own thing and not following styles in righteousness and rebellion set by their big brothers at the universities, a glance through these two studies of student insurrections—one on Columbia University's Morningside Heights, the other at Harvard Yard—will convince you of the opposite. The college revolutionaries portrayed in these books appear hardly more genuinely humanistic or intelligently rebellious than their adolescent counterparts.

Roger Kahn's impressively researched history of the Columbia revolt does us a service by granting glimpses from time to time of Mark Rudd sans his ideological war-paint—and what is revealed isn't always pretty. Indeed, it seems that only Kahn's evenhanded liberalism keeps him from planting the ax even deeper.

Steve Kelman, an articulate Harvard undergraduate, isn't forced by political centralism to regard all sides with false fairness. He is an outspoken socialist with an old-fashioned dedication to social justice and democracy, outraged by the brutality, egoism, power-hunger and phoniness of the New Left in general, and their "glorious liberation" of Harvard in the spring of 1968 in particular. He not only questions the good intentions of those who precipitated the chaos he suffered at Harvard, he also recognizes the unreality of revolutionary actions by those not directly injured by economic and political pressures. In the hands of elitist and wealthy radicals at Harvard, revolt became a brutal ritual serving personal needs rooted in existential confusion, ennui and psychopathology. The process, Kelman demonstrates in detail, is a sinister and irrational one. One of his conclusions brands itself into one's memory: "Student revolutionary organizations have almost always been banes of the dispossessed classes they are supposedly trying to help." Amen. If the reactionary disaster should ever come, it's not hard to imagine affluent radicals retreating to the comfort of their families while the less fortunate of the country truly suffer.

Nonetheless, for the moment revolution is chic, and the books—already a score more than those mentioned here—keep rolling from the presses. ■

"Revolution for the hell of it? Why not? It's all a bunch of phony words anyway. Once one has experienced LSD, existential revolution, fought the intellectual game-playing of the individual in society, of one's identity, one realizes that action is the only reality; not only reality but morality as well. One learns reality is a subjective experience. It exists in my head. I am the Revolution."—Abbie Hoffman in "Revolution For the Hell of It."

"We go into a psychology class on 'Thinking,' a huge lecture hall with 300 students. The professor is up front, diagraming behavior on the blackboard. Everybody writes down in their notebook every word he spews.

"His first words are, 'Good morning, class.'

*The guy next to me copies down,
'Good morning, class.'*

"Somebody raises his hand and asks:

'Do we have to know that for the exam?'"—Jerry Rubin in "Do It!"

"The meeting never quite got off the ground (meetings seldom do). Everybody suspected the others of being impossibly straight or insufficiently militant, I suppose, and the 'leaders,' those who had called the meetings, accused the lot of us of apathy. . . . Frustration set in (it always does) and, as usual, several people attempted to talk at the same time, precipitating the 934th parliamentary hassle I've suffered since leaving home for college. And finally it was decided that another meeting would be held."

—Raymond Mungo in "Famous Long Ago."

"It is necessary for young people to know that we must use organized and practical techniques. We cannot let ourselves continue to be oppressed on a massive scale. We are not trying to be supermen, because we are not supermen. We are fighting for the preservation of life. We refuse to be brainwashed by comic-book notions that distort the real situation. The only way that the world is ever going to be free is when the youth of this country moves with every principle of human respect and with every soft spot we have in our hearts for human life, in a fashion that lets the pig power structure know that when people are racistly and fascistically attacked, the youth will put a foot in their butts and make their blood chill."—Bobby Seale in "Seize the Time."

"All too often, though, we confuse the doer with the deed and think that they are one and the same. It is the deed we must hate, not the doer of the deed. The policeman acts like a beast, but to call him a beast, a 'pig,' is only to negate the potential of man that is within him. . . . To yell 'Fascist!' at a Wallace supporter is only to guarantee that that individual will be a fascist."—Julius Lester in "Revolutionary Notes."

st
p.m.

How It Was Done

By CURT SCHLEIER

"He is extremely intelligent, responsible and really a professional. His writing is well structured and has a great deal of style. He's been very cooperative as far as promoting the book, and it really was a pleasure working with him."

The speaker, obviously, is a publishing executive; in this case, strait-laced, in-from-Fairfield-County-every-morning Donald Hutter, editor-in-chief of Dial.

Somewhat less expected is the subject of Hutter's compliment: Yippie leader Abbie Hoffman, part-time revolutionary, part-time clown and, judging from recent publishers' lists, pretty near a full-time author.

Hoffman has two books out currently, "Revolution for the Hell of It," published by Dial, and "Woodstock Nation," Random House. Both are typical of a recent rash of works written by authors who fall under the generally accepted genus of radical—the New Left, Black Panthers, the high-school underground—or about radical subjects.

Despite the wide range in quality of writing, virtually all the 30-odd books share several common characteristics. For one thing, the editors who worked on the manuscripts tended to be young (in their late twenties and early thirties) and liberal in their political thinking.

Daniel Moses, for example, the Simon & Schuster editor who handled Jerry Rubin's "Do It," is 34 years old, wears granny glasses and his hair shoulder-length. "I don't look like I work for Metropolitan Life or I.B.M.," he admits. Moses sums up his political philosophy this way: "If American society is polarizing the young and the old, then I, as an individual, stand on the side of the students," a position representative of most of the editors queried.

Perhaps because of their left-of-center leanings, the editors seemed to get along extremely well with the authors. Moses says his relations with Jerry Rubin were excellent. "We had our little to-dos, but that's understandable. All the time he worked on the book, he had the Chicago trial facing him, and he was under severe emotional strain."

Arnold Tovell, Beacon Press, edited "Famous Long Ago," Ray Mungo's reminiscence of his life as editor of The Liberation News Service. Their relationship was so good that Tovell and his family were invited to weekend at Mungo's commune, where they

slept in a Spartan room on a bed five feet off the ground. "It was built that way because heat rises," Tovell says. "And it can get pretty cold in Vermont. It was the first time in my life that I had to step on a chair to get into bed."

Another similarity shared by most of the editors is that the manuscripts they received were relatively clean and did not require extensive revisions. Several of the writers, of course—notably Herbert Marcuse, whose "Five Lectures" was published by Beacon in April—have been writing for years. Only one editor—nameless by request—came close to saying that one manuscript was somewhat less than standard. "We worked very closely together," he said about an author, a euphemism for "It required a great deal of rewriting."

Surprisingly, most of the editors felt that the fame—or notoriety—of the authors was secondary in importance to the contents of the book, surprising because sales figures seem to indicate otherwise. The best sellers of the group have been written by the Rubins (over 190,000 paperback copies of "Do It" have been sold at this writing, and are continuing to sell at the rate of 3,000 to 5,000 copies per week) and the Hoffmans (over 125,000 soft-cover copies of "Revolution for the Hell of It" sold).

- Tolson _____
- DeLoach _____
- Walters _____
- Mohr _____
- Bishop _____
- Casper _____
- Callahan _____
- Conrad _____
- Felt _____
- Gale _____
- Rosen _____
- Sullivan _____
- Tavel _____
- Soyars _____
- Tele. Room _____
- Holmes _____
- Gandy _____

BOOK REVIEWS

TOP CLIPPING
DATED 7-12-70
FROM NEW YORK TIMES
MARKED FILE AND INITIALED

- The Washington Post _____
- Times Herald _____
- The Washington Daily News _____
- The Evening Star (Washington) _____
- The Sunday Star (Washington) _____
- Daily News (New York) _____
- Sunday News (New York) _____
- New York Post _____
- The New York Times S-Book Review
- The Sun (Baltimore) _____
- The Daily World _____
- The New Leader _____
- The Wall Street Journal _____
- The National Observer _____
- People's World _____
- Examiner (Washington) _____

Date JUL 12 1970

62-46855-A-
NOT RECORDED
10 JUL 28 1970

56 JUL 20 1970
P-772

John J. Simon of Random House edited Bobby Seale's "Seize the Time." Simon feels Random House "would have published the book if it had been written by Joe Doaks. It's simply a well done work about a man's life. Frankly, some of our important authors aren't as good."

Probably more realistic, however, was Joyce Johnson's appraisal. Mrs. Johnson, now with McGraw-Hill, edited both "Revolution for the Hell of It" and "Picking Up the Gun," by former Black Panther Earl Anthony, when she was at Dial.

"It's much harder for a book by an author no one has heard of to surface unless it's really an exceptional book," she feels. On the other hand, Mrs. Johnson contends that notoriety is not enough to make a book a best seller. "Sure, Abbie is notorious, but there's a lot of really brilliant stuff in his book."

There was total agreement on the effect publicity—such as the Chicago conspiracy trial—has on sales. Simply, sales go up. But this, as James H. Silberman, editor-in-chief at Random House, points out, "is true about every book we publish." Adds John Simon, "Virtually every articulate author on the 'Today' show sells books."

Simon & Schuster's Moses, however, contends that for this type of book, the publicity reaches a "secondary audience"—adults who might not be aware of Jerry Rubin or that he wrote a book unless he presented an inscribed copy to Judge Julius Hoffman, an event duly recorded in the nation's papers.

The primary audience, Moses feels, is young people, who are "subject to word-of-mouth reviews. Someone brings a copy of the book into a dormitory, and, if he likes it, spreads the word."

Moses's contention seemingly is borne out by the sales statistics. As might be expected, the highest figures are recorded in college book stores, university towns and large urban areas like New York, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles and San Francisco. Similarly, when a book is brought out simultaneously in soft and hard cover, paperback sales (one always associates paperbacks with students, even at \$1.95 to \$2.95 plus tax—even in these affluent times) outpace cloth sales by a margin of roughly 10 to 1. In fact, when there is dual publication, the hard-cover edition is brought out solely for the benefit of reviewers—who reportedly have an aversion to passing judgment on books that come out only in paperback—and for sale to institutions.

Since a definite relationship between events and these books exists, timing became a critical factor. Many, therefore, were produced in weeks instead of the months it normally takes.

The most unusual production schedule was at Avon, which rushed 115,000 copies of "The Middle of the Country," about the Kent State massacre, to newsstands and book stores in less than three weeks.

Editor-in-chief Peter Mayer was in Cleveland on a business trip the day of the shootings, and his plane back to New York was filled with students returning home. One, Bill Warren, engaged Mayer in conversation and suggested the book.

The idea was approved, and Warren spent the next several days in Avon's New York office calling students, faculty members—anyone who might have seen the incident and would have photos or a story to tell. Because she was the closest in age, a young assistant editor, Karen Levine, was asked to coordinate the effort.

As reports came in—many by telephone—they were taken down on any available typewriter, collected and shipped en masse to Chicago—without editing or proof reading—to be printed. This process differed even from most instant books, which are largely prepared before an event—a moon landing or a spectacular trial—with just enough space left over to fill in the very dramatic ending.

Editors unanimously attributed their houses' motives for publishing these books to something higher than money. Said one: "I find it hard to believe that any publisher could make enough money on these books to really make it worth his while. If there were

not some desire to let the author's views be known—and to let him tell it himself, not be quoted in a newspaper or magazine—then these books never would be published."

Adds another: "When people talk to journalists, there's a good chance that there will be some distortion. Publishing is the only medium that affords these authors an opportunity to say it as it is in their own words. Right now there's a need for these books. They're important as news, and we felt that we had to offer this opportunity."

Summing it up best perhaps is a poignant story told by Jeremy Cott of Beacon Press, who edited Father Daniel Berrigan's "The Trial of the Catonsville Nine" and "Trial Poems." Cott quotes a conversation he had with Father Berrigan about a manuscript delivery date:

Father Berrigan: "I can have it for you in late August."

Cott: "Fine, but late September is all right, too."

Father Berrigan: "No, late August. I might be in jail by September."

Cott: "Well, then your manuscript is something of a risk, isn't it?"

Father Berrigan: "Yes, but then so is the entire peace movement." ■

5
X
DIRECTOR, FBI (62-46855)
(ATTN: RESEARCH SECTION -
DOMESTIC INTELLIGENCE DIVISION)

4/8/70

SAC, NEW YORK (100-87235)

PURCHASE OF BOOKS
BOOK REVIEWS

ReBulet 2/4/70.

Enclosed for the Bureau are two copies of
"Inside a Soviet Embassy" by A. KAZNACHEEV.

ORIGINAL FILED IN
62-46855-21

62-46855
NOT RECORDED
145 APR 10 1970

- ③ - Bureau (Encls. 2)
(1-Attn: Research Section -
Domestic Intelligence Division)
1 - New York

MMM:lh

57 APR 17 1970
F 211

Tolson ☒
DeLoach ☒
Walters _____
Mohr _____
Bishop ☒
Casper _____
Callahan _____
Conrad _____
Felt _____
Gale _____
Rosen ☒
Sullivan ☒
Tavel _____
Soyars _____
Tele. Room _____
Holmes _____
Gandy _____

Most Whites Are Racist, Rights Panel Essay Says

By DUNCAN SPENCER
Star Staff Writer

Almost every white American is a racist—whether or not he thinks, knows, or does anything about, U.S. racial problems—according to an essay released by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights today.

In the 50-page pamphlet, written by an economist who was a consultant to the Kerner Commission, a new definition of the explosive term is attempted. Under the definition, practically every institution of government and industry here is part of a "system" that discriminates against non-whites.

Attached to the essay are the comments of five commission members, two of whom, vice chairman Stephen Horn, and member Robert S. Rankin, enter strong objections to some of the essay's methods and conclusions. The commission approved the essay as a whole, however, as a "catalyst" for producing national debate on the issue.

The author is Dr. Anthony Downs, senior vice president of the Real Estate Research Corp., and a consultant to the Rand Corp., the Urban Institute, the Brookings Institution, the Ford Foundation, and a number of federal agencies.

All whites, he says, have contributed to a system that "constantly produces racist effects from actions which are usually not overtly racist in either content or intention."

He says he was concerned, after publication of the Kerner Report, which examined the causes of the 1967 riots and blamed white attitudes, that many whites were enraged at being labeled racists even though they had little opportunity to practice it.

He makes his new definition of the term "any attitude, action or institutional structure which subordinates a person or group because of his or their color."

Downs is quick to differentiate racism from racial pride. Thus,

3 Copies
"RACISM IN AMERICA;
AND HOW TO COMBAT
IT" by DR. ANTHONY
DOWNS, rec'd 3-16-70.

IC to SC G.C. MOORE, RIS, Div. I;
IC to BUREAU LIBRARY;
IC to SC CL MCGOWAN Div. II.

he argues the black power, black awareness, and other minority solidarity movements are racist. "only when these reactions involve some sort of subordination."

Downs outlines two main objectives to combat racism: First, to change the behavior of whites so they will no longer consciously or unconsciously support racism, and second, to increase the capabilities of non-white groups so they can overcome the handicaps racism imposes.

He proposes nine basic strategies, including the following:

Build up the capabilities of minority group members through political support and support for concepts such as black power and black nationalism to give minorities greater bargaining power.

Develop legislation to make it the self-interest of whites to support minority aims.

Develop alliances of non-whites and whites to obtain common goals in place of the separate efforts which are now the norm.

Open up "many more" opportunities for minority group members in business, housing, schools and personal daily life.

REC-21

R.D. [Signature]

AMB.

Done

The Washington Post _____
Times Herald _____
The Washington Daily News _____
The Evening Star (Washington) ☒
The Sunday Star (Washington) _____
Daily News (New York) _____
Sunday News (New York) _____
New York Post _____
The New York Times _____
The Sun (Baltimore) _____
The Daily World _____
The New Leader _____
The Wall Street Journal _____
The National Observer _____
People's World _____
Examiner (Washington) _____

Date MAR 9 1970

FINAL EDITION

REC-21

62-46855-A

NOT RECORDED
1970

File 62-46855
SAMB.

60 APR 13 1970

4112

BOOK REVIEW

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

Tolson _____
DeLoach _____
Mohr _____
Bishop _____
Casper _____
Callahan _____
Conrad _____
Felt _____
Gale _____
Rosen _____
Sullivan _____
Tavel _____
Trotter _____
Tele. Room _____
Holmes _____
Gandy _____

TO : Mr. Bishop *✓*

DATE: August 22, 1967

FROM : M. A. Jones *✓*

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF "FAMOUS DETECTIVES"
BY EUGENE B. BLOCK

Book Reviews

Captioned book was recently sent us by the author, who is on the Special Correspondents' List. The book is autographed: "To my highly esteemed friend, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover--with deep appreciation of his wonderful help in my book ventures. Our meeting last October was a highlight in my life. Eugene B. Block, August 1, 1967." Mr. Block previously advised us that he was forwarding a copy of the book, and he was thanked by letter of 1-18-67.

REVIEW OF "FAMOUS DETECTIVES"

This book consists of thirteen chapters, each dealing with an individual detective. In addition to the Director (Chapter 3), the other "famous detectives" are: Allan Pinkerton; Raymond C. Schindler; Frederick R. Cherrill, Head of Fingerprint Department of Scotland Yard; George W. Cornish, Superintendent, Scotland Yard; George Hunter White, U.S. Bureau of Narcotics; Tamegoro Ikii, Deputy Chief, Tokyo Metropolitan Police; Joseph Petrosino, New York Police Department; William J. Burns, Secret Service; Charles Chenevier, French Surete; Ora E. Slater, Cal Crim Detective Bureau, Cincinnati; Edward Oscar Heinrich of California; and Daniel J. O'Connell, Southern Pacific Railroad.

Enclosure *sent 8-23-67*

- 1 - Mr. DeLoach - Enclosure
- 1 - Mr. Bishop - Enclosure
- 1 - Mr. Sullivan - Enclosure
- 1 - Miss Gandy - Enclosure
- 1 - Mr. Suttler - Enclosure

ULG:nvh/jab (9)

EC-D WICK

EBI

62-50468-5579 AUG 31 1967

NOT RECORDED

46 SEP 1 1967

ORIGINAL FILED IN 63-90355-107

391
56 SEP 8 1967

CONTINUED - OVER

CORRESPONDENCE

Jones to Bishop Memo
RE: REVIEW OF "FAMOUS DETECTIVES"
BY EUGENE B. BLOCK

Chapter three, which is entitled "Chief of the FBI" sets forth background concerning Mr. Hoover and the FBI and details our activities in connection with John Dillinger. Block begins this chapter by stating "Ask anyone to name the most famous detective in America today and without hesitation he will answer: 'J. Edgar Hoover, of course. He's the boss of the FBI. '"

Material for this chapter was furnished to Block by the Bureau. Block met the Director on 10-21-66.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the attached letter be forwarded to Block thanking him for the generous sentiments expressed in his autograph.

Is Someone Bugging You?

MR. WESTIN, who teaches public law and government at Columbia, is the author of "Privacy and Freedom," to be published this spring.

THE INTRUDERS: The Invasion of Privacy by Government and Industry. By Senator Edward V. Long. Illustrated. 230 pp. New York: Frederick A. Praeger. \$5.95.

By ALAN WESTIN

READERS of the Congressional Record and regular visitors to the Senate chamber during the past three years have grown accustomed to a rather special bit of ritual. A short, stocky man wearing rimless glasses and smiling almost pixelishly is recognized by the chair. "Mr. President," the man announces tartly, "my Big Brother item for today is. . . ." With this introduction, Senator Edward V. Long, Democrat of Missouri, places in the Record his latest example of wiretapping, personality testing, lie-detector probing, peephole and camera watching, or other assorted methods of surveillance of individuals by government and industrial investigators. At the end of the insertion comes the Senator's favorite question: "Mr. President, how far will Big Brother be allowed to go in America?"

Senator Long's Big Brother items sometimes come from the press or from magazines in the field of technology, law and the social sciences. But the majority of them are products of hearings on invasion of privacy held since 1964 by the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which Senator Long is chairman. Now the Senator has produced a book reporting the main findings of these hearings, a full-dress parade of government tappers, private eyes, corporate sleuths and private voyeurs, with well-chosen illustrations to show how ominously wide and unrestricted is the surveillance net they have cast. The book also summarizes the legal status

under American law of wiretapping, eavesdropping, polygraphing and other intrusive techniques, and offers Senator Long's recommendations for legislative action. The book comes at a perfect time, since a major effort is now developing to get Congress finally to pass legislation on government and private use of electronic eavesdropping.

THE writing of Senator Long's book underscores the fact that in the past decade Congressional committees have emerged as one of the most energetic and effective forces supporting privacy. By exposing the practices of Federal agencies, the committees have accomplished several things: they have prompted executive action ending many of the most flagrant official activities; they may well have laid the groundwork for major Federal legislation in the near future; and they have provided official support for some present and future judicial declarations expanding the constitutional and common law rights of privacy.

At least a dozen committees of Congress have dealt with this issue in the 1960's, but four main committees have been the leaders in this area: Senator Long's subcommittee; the House Government Operations Committee, under Rep. John Moss of California; the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, under Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina; and the House Subcommittee on Invasion of Privacy, under Rep. Cornelius Gallagher of New Jersey.

How the story told in "The Intruders" was put together by the Long subcommittee is worth noting, since it is not described in the book. With Senator Long's support and general approval, the subcommittee's chief counsel, Bernard Fensterwald, Jr., a shrewd Washington hand and veteran staff director of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly subcommittee, began in 1963 to look into the use of

Tolson _____
DeLoach _____
Mohr _____
Wick _____
Casper _____
Callahan _____
Conrad _____
Felt _____
Gale _____
Rosen _____
Sullivan _____
Tavel _____
Trotter _____
Tele. Room _____
Holmes _____
Gandy _____

The Washington Post _____
Times Herald _____
The Washington Daily News _____
The Evening Star (Washington) _____
The Sunday Star (Washington) _____
Daily News (New York) _____
Sunday News (New York) _____
New York Post _____
The New York Times **3 BOOK REVIEW** _____
World Journal Tribune _____
(New York) _____
The Sun (Baltimore) _____
The Worker _____
The New Leader _____
The Wall Street Journal _____
The National Observer _____
People's World _____

Date **MAR 5 1967**

ORIGINAL FILED IN

Book Reviews

70 MAR 27 1967

REC-100

62-46865-A

NOT RECORDED

47 MAR 21 1967

213
wiretapping and cavedropping by Federal agencies. No Congressional committee in the 1950's or early 1960's had ever been able to pry this account from Federal agencies and make it public.

First, the subcommittee's talented chief investigator, Raymond C. Cole Jr., sniffed around law enforcement circles and talked to the nation's leading private wiretapping experts. Since Federal agencies must buy their equipment with Government funds supervised by Congress, Fensterwald obtained the lists of listening and recording equipment approved by the General Accounting Office for Federal procurement. The subcommittee then wrote each manufacturer and asked which Federal agencies the equipment had been sold to. Armed with this information (a few threats of subpoenas were necessary to get the facts), the subcommittee then wrote each Federal agency which had purchased the equipment and asked for a report on the use being made of it. The choice was either to respond or else to contend that the equipment was not being used at all, an admission of waste that no Federal agency would be likely to make to Congress.

To supplement this line of attack, the subcommittee also drew up a general questionnaire asking each major Federal agency (apart from the FBI, military intelligence, and CIA.) to list all the eavesdropping equipment it owned and describe how it was being used. Since the word was out in Washington that the Long subcommittee had already been to

the suppliers, the pressure was on the Federal agencies to give accurate replies. Only when these questionnaire reports and some stormy interviews with Federal agency spokesmen had provided them with a clear picture of Federal use did the Long subcommittee staff move to public hearings in 1964.

With a well-developed sense of political timing, the Long subcommittee did not start its hearings by taking on that fortress of influence on Capitol Hill, the FBI. Instead, it opened its hearings with wiretapping and bugging practices by the Internal Revenue Service, a move guaranteed to trigger spasms of alarm down the spines of the nation's taxpayers. The subcommittee then moved to cavedropping by the Food and Drug Administration (intensifying fears in the business community) and to the Post Office, whose "mail covers" put the nation's basic system of correspondence under scrutiny and whose peephole and camera surveillance of postal employees stirred labor unions to full concern.

With these disclosures having laid the groundwork, the Long subcommittee turned to the FBI. Using its own sources and the disclosures that emerged from the Bobby Baker case, the subcommittee exposed such patterns of FBI practice as the leasing of telephone lines and, most damaging of all, the use of eavesdropping by the FBI in tax-evasion and gambling investigations. The carefully created image that the FBI taps and bugs only in cases involving national security or situations directly

imperiling human life was finally and publicly destroyed.

What "The Intruders" provides is a collection of the Long subcommittee data in one handy volume for the nonspecialized reader. The case against unchecked government and industrial use of electronic surveillance is made particularly well. Given the Senator's legal and policy focus, the book generally takes it for granted that Americans know what privacy is and when it is improperly invaded, though these issues are not always as simple when social interests are openly weighed. In addition, there could have been a more extended discussion of debate over law enforcement claims to the need of certain limited surveillance powers, if only to explain the basis on which Senator Long rejects these arguments.

DESPITE the points on which one would have liked further discussion, the Senator's policy suggestions on wiretapping and eavesdropping controls are carefully presented, and deserve the most thoughtful consideration from the press and Congress. His position calls for limiting Federal "third-party" wiretapping to a narrowly defined set of national security investigations (and forbidding all use of wiretap evidence in court); restricting Federal and state wiretapping to situations


in which one party to the conversation agrees to the monitoring; and providing a similar participant - approval limitation on law-enforcement use of bugging devices. In fact, this is very close to the stand taken by the Johnson Administration, embodied in the Administration bill just sent to Congress. There are still knotty legal and policy issues involved here, and some observers will feel that the better solution is a new system of controls rather than such a complete denial of eavesdropping authority in cases of conspiracy and violent crime. One hopes this issue will be fully discussed in Congressional hearings on the proposed bills.


Since the Long subcommittee is scheduled shortly to hold such hearings (as well as hearings on the J. Edgar Hoover-Robert Kennedy dispute over who authorized electronic eavesdropping during the Kennedy Administration); Senator Long is sure to be well-supplied with "Big Brother items" in the near future. Meanwhile, his book is a welcome source of information showing how far electronic eavesdropping has spread in our society, and how negligent our courts and legislatures have been in not supplying the necessary legal controls to assure that the individual's right to privacy receives the same care as his right to property.



Above, a shotgun fires a "spike mike," which, when embedded in a window or door frame, transmits conversations to the eavesdropper. Above right, a "shocker" is taped to a girl's back, and dimes are taped around it to serve as electrodes. Her partner can then transmit coded shocks across a room to guide her actions; the device can be used to cheat at gambling. The "knot" in the picture frame, right, conceals a radio transmitter that can operate for about 200 hours on a battery hidden behind the picture.

Illustrations from "The Intruders." Photographs, above and above right, LIFE Magazine, Arthur Schatz © 1966 Time Inc.





Subversive activities

By Alan Barth

LIBERALS AND COMMUNISM: The "Red Decade" Revisited
By Frank A. Warren III. Indiana University Press. 276 pp. \$6.95
THE COMMUNIST CONTROVERSY IN WASHINGTON: From the
New Deal to McCarthy. By Earl Latham. Harvard University
Press. 446 pp. \$7.95.

A decade has gone by since that tormenting national fever subsided which began with the creation of the Dies Committee in 1938 and reached its peak with the Senate's censure of Joe McCarthy in 1954. The time now seems ripe for an assessment of this period by critics who are free from emotional involvement in it and when the tensions about the internal threat of communism no longer inhibit public discussion.

Earl Latham is undoubtedly right in saying that "the temper of those years was suspicious, excited, emotional, pathetic, and hard. There was rage and outrage, accusation and defiance, a Babel of shouting anger. . . . There was worse—an erosion of that mutual trust which is the essential cement of any society. McCarthy himself—or what came to be known as McCarthyism—was the culminating symptom of the national sickness. In Latham's words:

Other political figures have been coarse and overbearing, loud and rude, without exciting the anxiety McCarthy generated. There was something else in his manner—a latency that yielded more meaning than the sum of his words; a sense of willingness to perpetrate gross assault without decency or restraint if it served his ends. He could literally unhinge the timid because he wrenched them from their confidence in the normal barriers that protect the personality from violation—courtesy, respect, and the due process of custom and law. McCarthy's power, "like a desolating pestilence," sickened the first two years of the first Eisenhower administration and, like the pox, left ineradicable pits and scars.

Behind the rage and the recriminations, however, lay a deeply troubling reality. An American Communist Party which was a docile tool of the Soviet Government had taken advantage at every turn of American tolerance, idealism, and Constitutional protection of political protest. And there can be no doubt that it had succeeded in infiltrating into public positions of responsibility and trust a number of persons who, at best, believed they could serve their country by serving Soviet interests or who, at worst, were agents of Soviet espionage.

These two books complement each other effectively. Both are solid works of scholarship, clearly defined in aim and written with detachment, verve, and style. Frank A. Warren's book is concerned wholly with the intellectual history of the 1930s, as it reveals the radical-liberal thought of that decade with respect to communism. By an exhaustive study of the polemical essays of a wide range of writers in such magazines as the *Nation*, the *New Republic*, and *Common Sense*, he is able to trace the development and alterations of liberal ideas, though perhaps in greater detail than the average reader is likely to appreciate.

The main trouble with this approach, however, is that almost every articulate political critic and commentator in the 1930s could be considered a liberal. And this means, obviously, that the rubric covered a bewilderingly wide range of opinion. Because of the very nature of liberalism, moreover, the opinions of almost all of its representatives, during a period of social upheaval, were in a continuous state of flux, and the range of their thinking was really too broad to permit valid generalization.

Liberals who became anti-liberal and called themselves conservatives came to indict their former associates as dupes of the Communists and as guilty, some-

Folson _____
DeLoach _____
Mohr _____
Wick _____
Casper _____
Callahan _____
Conrad _____
Felt _____
Gale _____
Rosen _____
Sullivan _____
Tavel _____
Trotter _____
Tele. Room _____
Holmes _____
Gandy _____

BOOK REVIEWS

The Washington Post and Times Herald 3-Benk.H.

The Washington Daily News _____
The Washington Evening Star _____
New York Daily News _____
New York Herald Tribune _____
New York Post _____
The New York Times _____
New York World Journal _____
New York World _____
Journal Tribune _____
The Baltimore Sun _____
The Worker _____
The New Leader _____
The Wall Street Journal _____
The National Observer _____
People's World _____

Date _____

NOT RECORDED

184 JUL 15 1966

JUL 10 1966

File 62-46855

now, of a betrayal of their own principles because they were not as quick as they might have been to condemn the excesses and outrages of the Soviet system. But this was a condemnation that ignored the fact that liberalism naturally took a hopeful attitude toward the Russian Revolution and toward the whole experiment of a classless society. Warren quotes Roger Baldwin:

For 15 years I looked with hope on the Soviet Union as a pioneer in creating an ordered and planned economy in which compulsion would gradually disappear. My support of the combined factors represented by the Soviet Union varied from a high at one time of about 80 per cent to a low of little over 50 per cent until finally, after 1936 when the great purges began, it dropped to a point where the evidence against the promise of the Soviet Union outweighed my hopes.

There is surely nothing discreditable in this position. Some liberals were disillusioned earlier; some held on to their hopes until the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939. Some were slow to accept the harsh truths about Soviet tyranny; tending to dismiss such reports as fabrications of a hostile press; some condoned these outrages as an inescapable cost and consequence of the revolution. Some shrewdly sensed the danger of collaborating with Communists in a Popular Front; some disregarded this danger out of a sense of confidence in the integrity of their own purposes. During the Popular Front period, Warren reminds us, the marked influence of Communism "resulted from an ideological and emotional appeal attuned to the liberals' need for ideological explanation and emotional assurance." As Warren goes on to point out, "the liberals did not respond simply as 'innocent dupes.' It was part of their creed that various groups, differing in methods but agreeing in general principles, could work together."

It is important to remember that throughout this period the liberals were engaged in their own vital program of social reform under the New Deal. They were busy building labor unions and promoting racial equality and advancing social welfare; and if the Communists wanted to tag along in these undertakings, most liberals were willing to let them. But in simple truth it was the Communists, not the liberals, who were the fellow-travelers in this arrangement.

Latham's book presents a larger canvas, which depicts the whole complex picture of the beginnings of Soviet espionage in America, the sensational charges and discoveries of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the development of the Federal Loyalty-Security Program, and the impact of McCarthyism. All this is done with objectivity, fairness, and judgment. Latham has aimed, and with considerable success, at a history of the period, not at a defense or an attack,

and views the characters in this drama with detachment. He provides the "new generation of people who have no memory of the tensions" of that period with a balanced account of events that gains in perspective what it may have lost in passion.

My main reservation is that Latham gives too much credence to the testimony of Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley. He remarks that "I have come across no argument against the credibility of the main stories of Bentley and Chambers that seemed to me convincing enough to suspend the tentative conclusion that most of what they said was correct." But one could with equal fairness put it differently and say that much of their testimony has not yet received the corroboration that enables us to accept it.

Behind both of these books lies the question of responsibility and guilt. In his concluding chapter, Warren quotes this criticism of liberal conduct from 1952:


Did not the major segment of American liberalism, as a result of joining hands with the Communists in a Popular Front, go on record as denying the existence of Soviet concentration camps? Did it not give its blessing to the "liquidation" of millions of Soviet "kulaks"? Did it not apologize for the mass purges of 1936-38, and did it not solemnly approve the grotesque trials of the Old Bolsheviks? Did it not applaud the massacre of the non-Communist left by the GPU during the Spanish Civil War?

All these questions deserve an outraged "No." Many liberals, it is true, were slow—or slower than they should have been—to recognize that the monstrous tyranny of Stalin had smashed their hopes for the Russian Revolution. But with very rare exceptions, they neither applauded nor condoned any of the aspects of this tyranny. They were guilty of no more than a persistent hope that the principles to which they gave fealty would emerge from the rubble of revolution.

But what of the guilt of those castigators of liberalism who betrayed its principles—who were quick to cry that dissent was entitled to no Constitutional protection if it could be labeled disloyal and who were ready, in the service of an hysterical anti-communism, to jettison the very institutions of democracy? Theirs, in truth, was the ugliest and most dangerous form of subversion, for they struck at the foundations of the American society.

By and large, despite much diversity of opinion among them on specific issues, the men recognized as the leaders and champions of liberalism in the post-war years held a reasonable and realistic view of communism. They contained the Soviet Union, and yet spared the world an Armageddon; they recognized the Communist movement for what it was, and yet refused to sacrifice civil liberty.

Alan Barth is an editorial writer for The Washington Post and the author of The Loyalty of Free Men, Government by Investigation and the Price of Liberty.
BOOK WEEK July 10, 1966



UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : Mr. Belmont

DATE: September 27, 1965

FROM : J. H. Gale

SUBJECT: "THE DEADLY SILENCE"
BY MRS. RENEE BUSE
INFORMATION CONCERNING

BOOK REVIEWS

ST
The above-captioned book, which has just been released for sale by Doubleday and Company, is devoted almost entirely to three interrelated narcotics cases involving Vito Genovese (La Cosa Nostra "Commission member"), John Ormento (a caporegima, or captain, in the Luchese "family"), Carmine Galante (a former caporegima in the Bonanno "family"), Vincent Gigante (Genovese's former bodyguard and chauffeur), and a number of other hoodlums operating in New York State and Canada. The book is only 234 pages long but sells for \$4.95 and is being widely publicized by Doubleday and Company.

Obviously written in close collaboration with the Federal Bureau of Narcotics--a picture of whose commissioner, Henry L. Giordano, appears on the dust jacket with the author--Mrs. Buse's book contains only one reference to the FBI. In describing the notorious meeting of La Cosa Nostra leaders which occurred at Apalachin, New York, in November, 1957, she says that the following day the switchboard at the Bureau of Narcotics was "jammed" by telephone calls from the FBI and other investigative agencies, "clamoring for files and information."

Mrs. Buse's writing style is fast-moving and highly readable but is so liberally sprinkled with errors and direct quotes, speculations, and private actions to which she could not possibly have had access, that her book is all but worthless from a documentary standpoint.

Probably the most flagrant example in this respect is a speech Genovese is supposed to have made at Apalachin, condemning such gangland wars as the "Gallo-Profaci family fight." In addition to the fact that no eyewitness has appeared to date to say what transpired at Apalachin, the Gallo-Profaci fight did not even start until nearly four years later.

- 1 - Mr. Mohr
- 1 - Mr. Belmont
- 1 - Mr. Suttler
- 1 - Mr. DeLoach

- 1 - Mr. Gale
- 1 - Miss Butler
- 1 - Mr. McAndrews
- 1 - John E. McHale, Jr.

CONTINUED OVER

62-46855-

RECEIVED BY NOT RECORDED
102 OCT 4 1965

Tolson
Belmont
Mohr
DeLoach
Casper
Callahan
Conrad
Felt
Gale
Rosen
Sullivan
Tavel
Trotter
Tele. Room
Holmes
Gandy

R. W. Smith

James
4264

ORIGINAL FILED IN 92-6054-1310

197
JEM:djg
1965

OCT 6 1965

Memorandum to Mr. Belmont
Re: "The Deadly Silence"

Mrs. Buse also identifies Frank Costello as the late Albert Anastasia's "first assistant" (whereas the two had actually been "bosses" of their respective "families" and "Commission" members for a number of years prior to Anastasia's assassination in 1957). Nor is there any substantiation for her statement that Joe Profaci was then "the Big Boss," since reliable sources have advised that Genovese--after ordering Costello and Anastasia shot--personally called the meeting, set the agenda, and approved the site where it was to be held.

Still two other errors appear in the reason Mrs. Buse offers for the holding of the meeting and the number of persons present. The theory that underworld leaders had come from as far away as the west coast to decide the fate of a New York City hoodlum who had been accused of trying to "muscle into another man's exclusive jukebox territory" was first advanced by Lieutenant William Mooney, of the New York City Police Department, who later advised that he had no factual proof for the statement.

In saying that 45 men were detained by the New York State Police after leaving the Apalachin meeting, Mrs. Buse also proves that she did a minimum of research on her book, aside from contacting Giordano and other representatives of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. If, for instance, she had read Sergeant Edgar D. Crosswell's testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, she would know that a total of 60 were actually detained.

Bureau files reveal that Mrs. Buse was appointed editor of "True Detective" magazine in September, 1951, and that we have enjoyed a limited, but friendly, correspondence with her since that time. In April, 1952, she was afforded a special tour of the Bureau's facilities at the Seat of Government.

ACTION:

For information. Mrs. Buse's book will be forwarded to the Bureau Library for permanent retention.

V. A J. J. C. S. M. P.

BOOKS

The essays of Mills

POWER, POLITICS, AND PEOPLE

PLE: The collected essays of C. Wright Mills, edited by Irving Louis Horowitz. Oxford University Press. 657 pp. cloth, \$8.50. Ballantine Books. Paperback, \$1.45.

C. WRIGHT MILLS broke his heart fighting for the truth. That's the way to live, and the way to die; what a tragedy that his heart was not stronger so that he could have given of his strength, courage, integrity, and learning for another generation.

Though he died at the age of 46, he managed to accomplish a great deal; he produced at least four first-rate books and, during the last decade of his life, no one more than Mills symbolized—especially for students—rebellion against the Establishment, against dogma, and a kind of fierce, intensely personalized devotion to honesty.

In his last years, Mills moved more and more vigorously to an examination of, and an attack upon, U.S. imperialism. In his posthumously published anthology, *The Marxists*, he announced himself a Marxist—a "plain one," he hastened to add, by which he meant to make clear his non-affiliated individualism. And Saul Landau, his research assistant during the last months of his life, writes that after visiting the U.S.S.R., shortly before his death, Mills—though persisting in a sharply critical outlook—was confident that the Soviet peoples would succeed in the greatest undertaking to confront human beings—the building of a Communist society.

PROF. IRVING Louis Horowitz, of Hobart and William Smith Colleges, has now presented, manifestly as a labor of love, Mills's collected essays. The book is over 650 pages and contains about 360,000 words. Of the 41 essays, some appear for the first time in print.

The volume is divided into four parts: Power, Politics, People, Knowledge. The first concentrates on the structural, the second on the ideological, the third on the psychological, and the fourth on the sociological. All manifest Mills's wide learning, fierce honesty, polemical style and dissenting commitment.

Two of the finest essays are reviews: one a devastating critique of James Burnham's *Managerial Revolution*, the other a warm appreciation of the late Robert A. Brady's splendid *Business as a System of Power*. Both offer significant analysis of the nature of fascism and of reaction in capitalist societies.

I HAVE selected two paragraphs that summarize Mills.

The first is from "The Conservative Mood," published in 1954, a year marking the highest point of influence of the "neo-conservatives":

"The intellectual core of the groping for conservatism is a giving up of the central goal of the secular impulse in the West: the control through reason of man's fate. It is this goal that has lent continuity to the humanist tradition, re-discovered in the Renaissance, and so strong in 19th Century American experience. It is this goal that has been the major impulse of classic liberalism and of classic socialism."

The second is from "Mass Society and Liberal Education," also written in 1954. These sentences conclude that essay:

Tolson _____
Belmont _____
Mohr _____
Casper _____
Callahan _____
Conrad _____
DeLoach _____
Evans _____
Gale _____
Rosen _____
Sullivan _____
Tavel _____
Trotter _____
Tele Room _____
Holmes _____
Gandy _____

REC-1

Book Review

REC 22

162-46855-A
NOT RECORDED
191 SEP 16 1963

The Washington Post and Times Herald _____
The Washington Daily News _____
The Evening Star _____
New York Herald Tribune _____
New York Journal-American _____
New York Mirror _____
New York Daily News _____
New York Post _____
The New York Times _____
The Worker _____
The New Leader _____
The Wall Street Journal _____
The National Observer _____
Date 8/29/63
National Guardian
Page 7

67 SEP 21 1963

File 62-46855

"Politics as we know it today often rests upon myths and lies and crackpot notions; and many policies, debated and undebated, assume inadequate and misleading definitions of reality. When such myth and hokum prevail, those who are out to find the truth are bound to be upsetting. This is the role of mind, of intellect, of reason, of ideas—to define reality adequately and in a publicly relevant way. The role of education, especially of education for adults, is to build and sustain publics that will go for, and develop, and live with, and act upon, adequate definitions of reality."

"Those who are out to find the truth are bound to be upsetting"—yes, indeed, and especially in a society based on fraud and devoted to deceit. Mills lived in such a society, recognized it as such, and devoted his great talents to being as "upsetting" as he could.

Within a brief review, I do not wish to develop the weaknesses in Mills. But I cannot forbear noting that in all the hundreds of thousands of words Mills wrote, in these collected essays—as also in his books—the existence of the Negro people is simply ignored.

AS TO the editing of the volume, the essays in the body of the book, are not dated and their sources are not given; the reader must go to considerable trouble—poring through the front and rear of the volume—to find these basic facts. While I think the four-part arrangement of the essays is useful, I do not understand why, within that format, they are then not presented chronologically, rather than in an order that seems to have little meaning. Note must also be taken of the large number of typographical errors.

These are, however, details. Mills's essays stand the test of time; their collection was a staggering task, and that Horowitz accomplished it is the great point. In his introduction, Horowitz writes: "The main drift of C. Wright Mills's work is linked to the practical importance of an ethically viable social science. This is so because such a sociology confronts the facts with integrity, and confirms the integrity by doing something about the facts." This is an apt summary of the work and life of Mills. —Herbert Aptheker



A. MITCHELL PALMER

Palmer as A Political Phenomenon

A. MITCHELL PALMER:
Politician. By Stanley Co-
ben. (Columbia University
Press, \$7.50.) **Book**

This is a searching and interesting study of the career of an ambitious Pennsylvania Democrat — a reformer and an insatiable grasper for more political power.

Had Mitchell Palmer hailed from a less rock-ribbed Republican State than Pennsylvania — from New York, for example — he might easily have achieved his ultimate ambition, which was to be President of the United States. Although he was able to win election to the lower house of Congress and to become the most powerful Democrat in his State, he was unable to win a State-wide election for the Senate or to carry Pennsylvania in either 1912 or 1916 for Woodrow Wilson.

In 12 Years

Nevertheless, as the author has pointed out, he was able to achieve prominence, political power and high office. Within 12 years — from 1909 to 1921 — he was a member of the House, he was Democratic national committee man of Pennsylvania and party leader, he was alien property custodian during World War I and Attorney General, and in the early months of 1920 he was the leading likely nominee of the Democratic Party for President.

Although Mr. Palmer was able to fight his way from genteel poverty to wealth and affluence and always enjoyed a certain amount of luxury, his real love — as shown by Mr. Coben — was political power. It was his desire for political power and high office which led him from the championship of reform and organized labor to the exercise of drastic action, as Attorney General, during the Red scare.

Mr. Coben has given the keenest attention to the Red scare and Mr. Palmer's handling of the issue as Attorney General, particularly to the so-called Palmer raids in which hundreds of aliens suspected of being Communists and followers of the Bolshevik in Russia were rounded up for deportation. No other Attorney General, Mr. Coben writes, has ever flouted to such degree the civil liberties guaranteed under the United States Constitution. During the Red scare 36 bombs were mailed from New York to blow up important Americans in public office and private life. A bomb was hurled at the front of Mr. Palmer's own home and had he been in that part of the house he probably would have been killed.

Mr. Palmer's story, Mr. Coben writes, "is a classic example of democracy's most notorious weakness. Sagacious commentators, beginning with those who drafted the Constitution, have warned that the rule by majority is both the greatest glory and the most serious hazard to our system; that our liberties are endangered most not by tyrants, but by democrats. If Mr. Palmer was one of the dangerous men in our history, it was not because he attempted to impose his rule or his policies upon the people, but because he tried to win power by carefully attuning himself to what he thought were the strong desires of the American people." It seems unfair to Mr. Palmer, however, to suggest he was "most dangerous" for such reasons. A number of our leaders have carefully kept their ears to the ground to keep themselves in office — some of them in the White House.

—GOULD LINCOLN

Olson ☒
Belmont ☒
Mohr ☐
Casper ☐
Callahan ☐
Conrad ☐
DeLoach ☒
Evans ☐
Gale ☒
Rosen ☒
Sullivan ☒
Tavel ☐
Trotter ☐
Tele Room ☐
Holmes ☐
Gandy ☐

Book Reviews

Central Research

REC-15
62-46855-A
62-39871-A
NOT RECORDED
149
The Washington Post 1963nd
Times Herald
The Washington Daily News
The Evening Star
New York Herald Tribune
New York Journal-American
New York Mirror
New York Daily News
New York Post
The New York Times
The Worker
The New Leader
The Wall Street Journal
The National Observer
Date June 9, 1963

File

A B Butler
635

57 SEP 24 1963

54 JUN 21 1963

mk: noaction

Book Reviews

REC-25

Red Cloaks and Daggers

Reviewed by Pat Frank

Mr. Frank's 1956 novel, "Forbidden Area," told now a Soviet spy, educated as an American, landed and worked in the United States.

SCHOOL FOR SPIES. By J. Bernard Hutton. Coward-McCann. 222 pp. \$3.95.

THIS BOOK may raise goose bumps in the FBI but it will shake the Soviet Embassy. It is a factual spy book with the clear ring of truth in it. A lot of coded cables will be swapped across the Atlantic, asking, "How did Hutton find out?" and a more ominous, "Who talked?" For this is a really definitive study of the Soviet espionage system and how it works.

Hutton's background provides few clues. He was a writer for a Czech Communist paper until he was sent to Moscow in 1934. He was trained at the Lenin School. In 1938 he resigned from the Party and returned to Prague but was forced to leave Czechoslovakia because of his, at that time, unfashionable anti-Nazi articles. Now in London, "a citizen of no country," he writes for London and New York papers.

IT IS APPARENT that he has maintained some of his Moscow contacts by clandestine means, for he takes you inside the Russian spy schools and tells in detail how they operate, creating Americans,

Canadians, Englishmen, and others, out of Russians. American intelligence has known since 1945 that such schools existed, but never before has such a detailed description been published.

Russia's most important spy university, Hutton reveals, is called by the jawbreaker name Gacznyna. It lies, 100 miles southeast of Kuibyshev and encompasses an area of 425 closely guarded square miles. In this area are American, British and Canadian "colleges," or sectors.

An aspiring agent is screened for a year before he is tapped for Gacznyna. He must expect 10 years of training in an exact replica of an American or British or Canadian town before tests prove him capable of becoming an operative. He must think, speak and act like an American or an Englishman, but his heart and soul must remain Russian.

His cover, when he lands, say, in the United States, will be perfect. He will carry a legitimate birth certificate (although that person will be long dead). He will have all the documents, from driving licenses and Social Security card to passport, to prove his identity. And of course he will have money and freedom of movement. And he will have communications. He is

a carefully honed and very dangerous weapon.

Abel in the United States and Lonsdale in England attest to the success of the school. They were exposed and captured, true, but espionage is like an iceberg, with only one-tenth showing above the surface.

AFTER FINISHING "School For Spies," one is inclined to wonder what the United States is doing, until you remember the U-2. For years we maintained a continual aerial reconnaissance of Russia, and the Russians either didn't know about it or couldn't find a way to check it.

As a guess, I would say that one U-2 flight was worth a hundred highly trained graduates of that town with the unpronounceable name. After all, any filling station provides you, free, with a detailed map of vital areas of the United States, while in Russia there are not many filling stations, and none of them passes out maps.

Also, I would hope that the CIA has its own schools, where Americans learn to be Russians. In the long run, it may not matter very much. All you really need is an accurate reading on the thinking of one man in the Kremlin.

DE MOORE
BRANDEN
LITRENEO
TURNER
LINTON
KEAT

Century Search

Washington Post & Times Herald
April 15, 1962
Editorial Section
Page 6
162-46855-H
NOT RECORDED
199 APR 26 1962

ESPIONAGE

Book is being obtained for review 4-25-62 JMB

51 MAY 17 1962

48

EX-105

REC-25
REC-2

5 file 62-46855 JMB

Tolson _____
 Parsons _____
 Mohr _____
 Belmont _____
 Callahan _____
 Conrad _____
 DeLoach _____
 Evans _____
 Malone _____
 Rosen _____
 Tavel _____
 Trotter _____
 W.C. Sullivan _____
 Tele Room _____
 Ingram _____
 Gandy _____

CUBA VS THE C.I.A.

By Robert E. Light and Carl Marzani

\$1 ppd.

The GUARDIAN's Robert E. Light and Carl Marzani, a former State Dept. intelligence officer, have combined efforts to probe behind the "official" explanation of the unsuccessful Cuban invasion to get at Washington's real plan and real motives. They have pulled back Allen Dulles' cloak and exposed a dagger pointed at the world.

The authors chart the invasion in detail, from its inception to its demise. They list who was involved in the plotting and who was opposed. They reveal how close the unsuspecting American people came to nuclear war.

The plot reads like mystery fiction, but the characters are real and the story is true.

To understand the intelligence agency mentality, the authors examine the CIA and trace the career of its director. They include an SS document on a conversation between Dulles and a Nazi official in 1943.

A concluding section deals with the dilemma of U.S. foreign policy and points a way for Washington to adjust peacefully to a changing world.

Cuba vs. the CIA is a handy pocket reference (6" x 9") you can carry to answer the distortions you hear from friends and co-workers. You may want also additional copies for them.

MARZANI & MUNSELL
 160 W. 23 Street
 New York 11, N.Y.

Enclosed \$_____ Please send me _____
 copies of Cuba vs the
 CIA at \$1 a copy.

Name _____
 Address _____
 City _____ State _____

1 @ book
 my interest dig
 left N.Y. 7-10-61
 captioned "Book
 Reviews, Central
 Research Section"
 RMB

3 Book Reviews

162-46855-A
 NOT RECORDED
 176 JUL 19 1961

66 JUL 19 1961

central Research

The Washington Post and Times Herald _____
 The Washington Daily News _____
 The Evening Star _____
 New York Herald Tribune _____
 New York Journal-American _____
 New York Mirror _____
 New York Daily News _____
 New York Post _____
 The New York Times _____
 The Worker _____
 The New Leader _____
 The Wall Street Journal _____
 Date June 26, 1961
 NATIONAL GUARDIAN
 Page 9

Tolson ☒
 Belmont ☒
 Mohr ☒
 Callahan ☒
 Conrad ☒
 DeLoach ☒
 Evans ☒
 Malone ☒
 Rosen ☒
 Sullivan ☒
 Tavel ☒
 Trotter ☒
 Tele Room ☒
 Ingram ☒
 Gandy ☒

Anti-Reds Blamed In Undermining U. S. Churches

Anti-Communists are doing more to undermine America's churches than are the Communists, according to an article in the July issue of "The Episcopalian," church magazine.

Anti-Communists, the article states, are largely responsible for a "campaign which threatens to weaken and demoralize America's churches by planting in the public mind the suspicion that they are over-run by Reds."

The article goes on to say that, according to the F. B. I., Communists in this country are "as pleased with the results as if they had planned the whole operation themselves."

The article, entitled "What

About Communism in our Churches?" says that the charges are being made by "genuine, if extreme, conservatives, who are incensed at the social pronouncements of various Christian organizations. Actually, the article states, real Communist efforts to infiltrate the churches have met with failure."

Book Reviews

2 cc's July
 same requested
 let to NY, 7-10-61
 captioned "Book Reviews"
 Central Research Section
 AMB.

The Washington Post and Times Herald _____
 The Washington Daily News _____
 The Evening Star _____
 New York Herald Tribune 10 _____
 New York Journal-American _____
 New York Mirror _____
 New York Daily News _____
 New York Post _____
 The New York Times _____
 The Worker _____
 The New Leader _____
 The Wall Street Journal _____
 Date _____

162-46855-A-

NOT RECORDED

176 JUL 19 1961

66 JUL 19 1961

JUN 24 1961

100-67
OFFICE OF DIRECTOR
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

February 6, 1961

The Director and FBI are mentioned
on page 415 of the attached review
of "Best Sellers" in connection with
the review of the book "Valhalla" by
Jere Peacock.

Attachment
hbb

Mr. Tolson ✓
Mr. Mohr ✓
Mr. Parsons ✓
Mr. Belmont ✓
Mr. Callahan ✓
Mr. Conrad ✓
Mr. DeLoach ✓
Mr. Malone ✓
Mr. McGuire ✓
Mr. Rosen ✓
Mr. Trotter ✓
Mr. Evans ✓
Mr. Jones ✓
Mr. W.C. Sullivan ✓
Tele. Room ✓
Mr. Ingram ✓
Miss Holmes ✓
Miss Gandy ✓

RECEIVED
FBI
FEB 10 1961

BEST SELLERS

The Semi-Monthly Book Reviews

Published by the University of Scranton, Scranton, Pennsylvania



Vol. 20, No. 21

FEBRUARY 1, 1961

PRICE: 25 CENTS PER COPY

ENCLOSURE ATTACHED

REC-19

62-46855-17
NOT RECORDED

117 FEB 21 1961

ENCLOSURE

50 FEB 24 1961

ENCLOSURE



62-46855-A

195

Vic Brown, attracted physically to Ingrid, a young woman who works in his office, thinks he loves her, and after a very short time of dating and love making, realizes that "there isn't the magic there was at the beginning." . . . "I don't love her, and that's the awful truth." . . . "how can I tell her I've been taken in because sex and a dream have got all mixed up inside me?" . . . "I'm caught and that's a fact—oh, what a fool; what a bloody, bloody fool!"

Through the eyes of Vic, Mr. Barstow sees the universe as a Godless place of blind necessity and inexorable law, and seems to ask us not to weep, not to laugh, but to understand the misery of the "life sentence" Vic drifted into through his own weakness. Some of the inchoate philosophy of Vic is in such a passage:

"I reckon there's no such thing as sin and punishment. There's what you do and what comes of it. There's right things and there's wrong things, wrong things happen to you—and that's the punishment. But there's no easy way out because if you do only right things you don't always come off best because there's chance. After every thing else there's chance and you can do the best you can and you can't allow for that" p. 309).

After living through a series of unhappy and sometimes tragic events Vic realizes that the adventitious charms of Ingrid, who is now his wife, have disappeared. He hopes that together they can find a real love that will come with shared living. As he says, he hopes so, "because its for a long, long time."

Although the theme and the plot are as old as the sin that is described, the language, a combination of Yorkshire slang and profanity, is new (to me at least) and there is no denying that Mr. Barstow is a virtuoso of rhythm and accent.

There is much humor in the racy dialogue:

"She was a bint with the neatest pair of gams I've seen" (p. 83).

"Teeth, all sticking out of the gums any-old-how like grave-stones in a mouldy old church-yard" (p. 70).

"The trouble is there's two sides to everybody and Ingrid brings out all the worst in me instead of the best" (p. 209).

This is a novel written on a purely personal plane in the comic tradition of pure criticism. It is extremely witty and sad by turns, permeated with echoes of universal ideas: I have the distinct impression that Mr. Barstow knew Chekhov's line "Man will only become better when you make him see what he is like."

Clara M. Siggins, Ph.D.,
Boston College,
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

~~X~~ Peacock, Jere

Putnam. Jan. 9, 1961. 510p. \$4.95. (III)

This book is Endsville, as the teenagers say, in the field of obscene, vulgar and profane words. You may have wondered at times just how far it would be possible to go in that field? If you read *Valhalla* you will rest secure that the ultimate has been reached.

In this book you have a literal transcription of the talk and actions of a group of Marines who, after a session in the Korean War, come to Japan for an interlude between wars. If there are any punches pulled, you can't imagine what they are, except perhaps in the field of abnormality. This "realism" is going to count against the book, which is unfortunate, because the book is

worthwhile. It has a very important message. To have toned down the language and the descriptions would have deprived the book of much of its power.

Let us start by saying that this is an adult book. Secondly let us say that the realistic language is not put in as a lurid detail to lure a curious reader. The language is an essential and substantial part of the book. You might say that the book should not have been written, but you can't say that it should have been put through a kind of moral wringer.

From the book the first thing that we learn is that there is something wrong with the Marine Corps. They seem to be a group of men without ideals; they are men trained to kill; they are men who have turned sour. The general idea seems to be that they join the Corps under false inducements. Once in the Corps they are flooded with hypocrisy, e.g. a chaplain talks to them and contradicts what he says by shacking up with a Japanese girl in an area remote from the group. Their idea about things back in the USA is that the Capitalists are in power and that they are exploiting the poor. Speaking of Pretty Boy Floyd and Dillinger, one of the Marines says:

"The goddam insurance companies screwed them . . . , took their land, and everything they owned. Just like they're doing today. And they never committed half the crimes they were accused of. But Old J. Edgar Hoover took advantage of this, see? It was a good gimmick to get his start and build a name. After that," he said with contempt, "after they got a few of the big ones like Gillis, Floyd and Dillinger, you couldn't stop the glory boys."

"There's your goddam robber barons," Poke agreed, "The F.B.I."

Another thing which is evident from the book is the evil of a standby army. The ennui, the doing of things which have no meaning, (standing guard when there is nothing to guard), these things really drive the men. The author makes you feel the terrible tensions which build up in men separated from home life and the pathways of cultured man. (This Marine division was not part of the occupying force, just a division standing by in the event of further trouble in the Far East.) Perhaps this thing is necessary. Something should be done, if it is, to change things, e.g. screen out borderline maniacs and provide those remaining with some possibilities of family life.

There is a horrible account of life in a Marine Brig. The way the men are treated can not be duplicated, we hope, in jails for the worst criminals run in the worst way in the USA. And this treatment is for offenses which are minor. In the case of the man described in the book, it was for leaving his guard post and then going berserk. If this part of the book is true, there should be some investigation. This is by far the worst part of the book. A similar account in *From Here to Eternity* is tame compared to this. You are surprised to find that the Marine Corps could contain personnel so sadistic; secondly you are amazed to hear that they are not only tolerated but encouraged in their activity; and, lastly, you wonder how the men who command the Marines, can be so deaf to the rudiments of modern penology.

If there is a hero of the book, it is the Japanese people. When you recall that this is an account by a man who has no interest in building up these people, you are amazed to find out how friendly and likeable they are. Most of the contacts were with the women, with a

62-4685-A

sexual background; but looking beyond this it is surprising how kind they were, interested in the welfare of the men, understanding of the stresses they were going through, never trying to victimize or swindle them. The Marines seemed to travel easily, even in civilian clothes, all over the country. This is one of the most fascinating parts of the book.

Although this is the first book Mr. Peacock has written, he is not an amateur writer. He writes very well; he observes very closely and when he interprets the thoughts of his characters, even when they are Japanese, he does this with great skill. He is never boring. He is able to continue the narrative of the same individual for several chapters and only turns to another Marine when you yourself feel that things have gone far enough. We will hear much more of this young author. As a final word: while reviewing this book, I was present at a men's study group. The topic of discussion was a recent article in *America* on *Catcher in the Rye* which contains much profanity and sex. In line with this discussion I brought up *Valhalla*. All the men agreed that the language and drinking and fornication described in *Valhalla* are actually true accounts of life in the armed forces and also incidentally in many of our modern factories. In other words this is the state of affairs that our younger generation is headed for. To shut our eyes and bury our heads in the sand is not going to answer the question that Mr. Peacock is asking.

James Ball, S.J.,
Buffalo, New York

* * *

Dayan, Yaël *Envy the Frightened*
World. Jan. 17, 1961. 187p. \$3.50. (IIa)

The interest in this slim novel lies mainly in its picture of life in an Israeli village, situated close to the border and within earshot of hostile rifles. Its young author, Yaël Dayan, should know whereof she speaks, since she is the daughter of General Moshe Dayan, former commander-in-chief of the Israeli Army, in which she served two years, after enlisting in 1956 at the outbreak of the Sinai war, and where she earned her commission as a lieutenant.

The settlers of this pioneering colony of Beit-On are refugees from Europe, jealously wedded to their land and resolutely bent upon its defense. Save for the gentle old cobbler, Rabbi Lamech, and a handful of old folks, the faith of these rugged people reposes not in the God of their fathers but in the ground they till and the guns they carry. To defend the acres they have wrested from the flinty hills they feel they must rely solely upon their own strength, tenacity and courage. To this end weakness and fear must be bred out of their sons; and cowardice must be banished from their midst as the evil of evils.

In this Spartan environment, in a secret spot in the hills, we meet young Nimrod, a strong, sensitive, handsome boy of eight, playing the favorite game of the youngsters of the village, "Who is strong?" Each in turn must respond to the challenge by undertaking a feat that proves beyond doubt his fearlessness and strength. Nimrod excels in this kind of competition and under the tutelage of his father and the goading of Gideon, the village hero, quickly puts behind him the fairy tales, toys and fears of childhood to become a hardened, lonely uncommunicative young tough, bent upon prov-

ing himself a hero and patriot. If we were to judge his case as typical, it would appear that there is danger Israel may be rearing its own homebred type of Nazi.

However Gideon falls victim to his foolhardy recklessness and in his crippled and embittered state realizes how badly he was misled. He attempts in vain to open Nimrod's eyes to the errors of his ways, which have brought unhappiness to his family and threaten to wreck his marriage with Elli, a gentle Hungarian refugee. But it is not until he is engulfed with an overwhelming wave of fear for the safety of his own son, now playing in turn the game of "who is strong?" that Nimrod realizes that courage is rather the knowledge of what is to be feared than the fear of fear itself and that there may be, after all, grounds to envy the frightened. For adults who are interested in the conflicts and developments in Israel, this story, simply and artlessly told, with its moral that fearlessness can destroy a man, may prove of interest.

Edward G. Jacklin, S.J.,
Georgetown University,
Washington, D. C.

* * *

Wright, Richard *Eight Men*
World. Jan. 23, 1961. 250p. \$3.95. (IIb)

When Richard Wright died two months ago in Paris, he had reached the position of America's best-selling and most widely known Negro author. Born in poverty in the South, holding countless jobs to support himself and his family, undergoing constant abuse and mistreatment, this sensitive and gifted man told much of his personal story in the classic *Black Boy*. So many episodes in this autobiography are memorable; yet, perhaps, the most characteristic incident in the book was Wright's attempt as a youth to borrow books from a Southern library. Borrowing the library card of a friendly white man, Wright had to pretend that he was really obtaining the books for the white man. From such episodes as this, it is not difficult to see why Wright eventually exiled himself to France, where he had freedom from prejudice and where he could be accepted as a human being. A tragic and bitter story was Richard Wright's life, and, yet, the bitterness which permeates much of his literary work is purifying. This bitterness is both a lament and a cry for justice. Above all, this bitterness is the truth speaking in genuine sincerity.

This present book is a collection of eight narratives, one of which is more an autobiographical essay than a short story. All of these tales are written in simple, straightforward prose, which is generally effective and always moving. Sincerity and impassioned feeling constantly earmark Wright's style. At its best this style is a powerful and perfect medium for his down-to-earth people who are caught in fundamental situations. At its worst—in a story such as "Man, God Ain't Like That"—this style becomes schoolboyish and inept.

Most of this collection is devoted to Negroes, both in the South and in American urban society. One tale is set in Copenhagen, another in Africa and Paris. The non-American locale stories are considerably inferior to the American narratives, both in meaning and in conception. Wright is at his best in "The Man Who Saw the Flood," a story of Negro tenant farmers victimized by a flood; "Man of All Work," an episode about a decent

Tolson ✓
 Mohr ✓
 Parsons ✓
 Belmont ✓
 Callahan ✓
 DeLoach ✓
 Malone ✓
 McGuire ✓
 Rosen ✓
 Tamm ✓
 Trotter ✓
 W. C. Sullivan ✓
 Tele. Room ✓
 Ingram ✓
 Gandy ✓

DO NOT WRITE

Bonn's Censors Condemn Book by Nazi War II Hero

BONN, Nov. 19 (AP).—The West German government's censorship board has classified as "dangerous to youth" a book by the man who was the most decorated German soldier under the Nazi regime. It dismisses atrocities as mistakes in the heat of battle.

The author, Hans Ulrich Rudel, former colonel and pilot of a fighter-bomber, was credited with destroying a battleship and 519 tanks in 2,800 combat missions during the war.

Calls It "Hate Book"

The censorship board calls his book, "Of War and Peace," a "hate and propaganda book against the present democratic order."

The board, headed by a former prosecutor, Robert Schilling, was established six years ago. It includes representatives of the arts, book publishers and distributors, youth organizations, the churches and the state governments.

"We cannot ban a publication, but we can prohibit its sale to persons under eighteen

years of age and its public display," Mr. Schilling said.

"Also, we cannot act on our own initiative but only upon a complaint from a state government or a prosecutor."

Mr. Schilling said the board's first task was banning the sale of sadistic "comic books" imported from the United States, Sweden and Italy.

Got "Rid of Trash"

"We were very successful in getting rid of this trash," he said, "and the distributors co-operated fully and without protest."

Another problem has been so-called men's magazines.

"These magazines carry almost identical stories and they always deal with sex, sadism and brutality," Mr. Schilling said.

"There's always the American flyer shot down over Germany during World War II who is miraculously liberated from prison by sparsely clad females, or the shipwrecked American sailor in the South Pacific who, instead of hardship, winds up

with some jungle chief's harem."

Hundreds of war-adventure booklets have been flooding the West German market lately.

"These are being put out as true stories, but in most cases you can see after reading only a few pages that the author has absolutely no idea of military matters," Mr. Schilling said.

Praise for S. S.

A number of these booklets already have been put on the board's blacklist. Some call the Hitler S. S. (Elite Guard) the "advance guard of the concept of a united Europe."

The booklets usually portray the Germans as "super heroes" who frequently gulp a glass of schnapps before squeezing the trigger of a machine gun to mow down a few hundred Russian, American or British soldiers.

In one story, a Lt. Zahn and a handful of men climb into four captured Soviet tanks and in Soviet uniforms operate far beyond the front. Despite battles, the men find time to flirt with pretty Russian peasant girls and to drink plenty of schnapps. At one point, another lieutenant wants to "break the neck of a little animal" but is stopped by

a sergeant. The "little animal" is a Russian baby.

This story, the board maintains, has nothing to do with war literature. It is a collection of fantastic lies offered as truth and presents the horrors of war as a mere adventure.

"The booklets never touch on the criminal character of the attack on Russia," the board said, "and the horrors of war repeatedly are belittled by German soldiers telling each other dirty jokes."

Mr. Schilling said the authors of these booklets received \$120 to \$190 per story. Before the blacklist was issued, publishers sold several million of the booklets each month for fifteen cents each, he added.

The Washington Post and Times Herald _____
 The Washington Daily News _____
 The Evening Star _____
 New York Herald Tribune 6
 New York Journal-American _____
 New York Mirror _____
 New York Daily News _____
 New York Post _____
 The New York Times _____
 The Worker _____
 The New Leader _____
 The Wall Street Journal _____
 Date _____

REC-8

NOT RECORDED

149 DEC 28 1960

62 JAN 3 1961

NOV 20 1960

File 62-46855

The Castro Revolution From Opposite Sides

RED STAR OVER CUBA By
Nathan Weyl (Devlin
Adair, \$4.50)

LISTEN, YANKEE By C.
Wright Mills (McGraw-
Hill, \$3.95)

These books give completely opposite views of the Castro revolution.

In "Red Star Over Cuba" Mr. Weyl develops the thesis which his title indicates; that Castro has leaned so far to the left that he has fallen into the Soviet orbit or is about to.

Mr. Weyl points out that "the legend that the Cuban Communist Party backed Batista" was assiduously spread. The truth was that party had suffered horribly under Batista repression; some of its best cadres had been killed, manhandled or imprisoned, and the party was cowed and badly demoralized.

The Red Screen

The writer adds that a much more important consideration was that Castro had been advised to have nothing to do with known Cuban Communists or with the party. "The Soviet view" was that it was vital that the Castro movement be without visible Communist taint and hence eligible for world-wide liberal support. When specific communist cadres were needed, these would be supplied by the Soviet apparatuses.

Latin America, Mr. Weyl feels, can play a significant

constructive role in free world strategy during the coming decade. "For this to occur, it is essential that steps be taken to prevent communism from radiating outward from its Cuban base and to help the Cuban people to destroy the tyranny which is killing them swiftly and totally."

Pro Castro

Mr. Mills, who is a professor of sociology at Columbia, is frankly pro-Castro.

The author's views are set forth in a series of supposed letters from Cubans to a collective Yankee. According to the letter writers, we helped Batista exploit the masses of Cubans.

"Like much of Latin America but more so," this letter adds, "we're fed up with what your corporations and what your governments do down here. They've dominated us long enough."

In closing chapters, Mr. Mills says he agrees with most of what his letter writers charge. The author rejoices that the Cuban revolution "has swiftly destroyed the economic basis of capitalism—both foreign and Cuban. Most of this power was foreign—in fact, North American."

While Mr. Mills disclaims any sympathy for "Stalinism," it is hard to see what his book will accomplish beyond bringing comfort to Communists and fellow travelers. —C. B. J.

Tolson _____
Mohr _____
Parsons _____
Belmont ☒ _____
Callahan _____
DeLoach _____
Malone _____
McGuire ☒ _____
Rosen ☒ _____
Tamm _____
Trotter _____
W. J. Sullivan ☒ _____
Tele. Room _____
Ingram _____
Gandy _____

Book Review

Not Int

Copied

*Books obtained for review
AMB. B. J.*

The Washington Post and Times Herald _____
The Washington Daily News _____
The Evening Star C-5 _____
New York Herald Tribune _____
New York Journal-American _____
New York Mirror _____
New York Daily News _____
New York Post _____
The New York Times _____
The Worker _____
The New Leader _____
The Wall Street Journal _____
Date **DEC 11 1960**

REC- 35

162-46855-17-
NOT RECORDED
199 DEC 16 1960

59 DEC 21 1960

file 62-46855-

The Role of Law In Race Relations

Reviewed by George M. Johnson

United States Commissioner of Civil Rights and Professor of Law
Howard University Law School

RACE RELATIONS AND

AMERICAN LAW. By Jack
Greenberg. Columbia. \$10.

MOST AMERICANS today are genuinely disturbed over the status of the relations between the so-called white majority and nonwhite minorities who make up our national citizenry. Volumes have been written on various aspects of the problem. However, the role which law has played and is playing in affecting race relations is seldom written about in language sufficiently objective and nonlegalistic to be informative to the increasing number of people who need and desire to be better informed in this area.

"Race Relations and American Law" fills a real need and should be a welcome addition to the libraries of Federal, state and local government units, and private persons and organizations as well, with interests and responsibilities in the Nation's major domestic problem.

The book is not "light reading" and some readers, without a considerable background in American jurisprudence, may find it more difficult to absorb than earlier books, such as Stephenson's "Race Distinctions in American Law," published in 1910, or Mangum's "The Legal Status of the Negro," published in 1940. For any such difficulty, no excuse seems necessary. Law sometimes is difficult and it played a wider and more significant role in race relations in 1959 than it did in 1910, or even in 1940.

GREENBERG discusses the present state of the law as it relates to nine major subject areas: public accommodations, interstate travel, elections, earning a living, education, housing, criminal law, domestic relations and the armed forces.

Each subject area is discussed in a separate chapter with a separate conclusion. This treatment increases the book's usefulness. A reader whose immediate interest or responsibility relates to the subject area of voting can read the one-page conclusion to Chapter Five on "Elections" and get a summary statement of the contents of the chapter in language that is about as nonacademic as the subject area permits.

This is not to say that one will or can become well in-

formed simply by reading all the conclusions, totaling approximately 15 pages. The discussions in each chapter are objective, reasonably thorough and surprisingly brief considering the volume of available material relevant to the discussions.

TWO CHAPTERS are devoted to general discussion and analysis. One is concerned with the uncritical assumption that legislation can't eradicate prejudices. It is pointed out that law in the field of race relations seeks not to eradicate prejudice but to control behavior, i. e., the overt manifestations of prejudice. Race relations involves not only how people feel but what they do because they feel as they do. Law changes behavior even when attitudes and feelings may remain unchanged.

In answer to the more appropriate question—Can the law alter race relations?—author Greenberg states unequivocally: "The thesis of this book is that law often can change race relations, that sometimes it has been indispensable to changing them and that in fact it has changed them even spectacularly."

Mr. T. Ison ✓
Mr. Mohr ✓
Mr. Parsons ✓
Mr. Belmont ✓
Mr. Callahan ✓
Mr. Malone ✓
Mr. McGuire ✓
Mr. Rosen ✓
Mr. Tamm ✓
Mr. Trotter ✓
Mr. W.C. Sullivan ✓
Tele. Room ✓
Miss Gandy ✓

McK...
Free
K...

REC-88

Book Reviews

The Washington Post and Times Herald **EB**
The Washington Daily News _____
The Evening Star _____
New York Herald Tribune _____
New York Journal-American _____
New York Mirror _____
New York Daily News _____
New York Post _____
The New York Times _____
The Worker _____
The New Leader _____
The Wall Street Journal _____
Date _____

REC-88

NOT RECORDED

117 FEB 10 1960

57 DEC 7 1960

EX-102

62-46855-A JAN 3 1960

Substantial support is cited for this thesis and it will undoubtedly clear up misconceptions in the thinking of many readers.

Greenberg also analyzes and synthesizes the major court decisions which gradually have removed the cloak of legal respectability from Government-imposed racial segregation. This has been a significant development which has taken place since Mangum's book of 1940. He includes an excellent discussion of the legal problems involved in current efforts to apply and implement the legal principle now established, that Government-imposed racial segregation is illegal.

I know of no book of comparable size and readability that gives as much solid information on the why, how, when and which of law and race relations.

Date 9/21/59

To

☒ Director

FILE #

Att. CENTRAL RESEARCH SECTION

☐ SAC Title SELECTED PORTIONS OF
☐ ASAC "KHRUSHCHEV'S BLUEPRINT FOR
☐ Supv. FUTURE," FROM NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV
☐ Agent BOOK "FOR VICTORY IN PEACEFUL
☐ SE COMPETITION WITH CAPITALISM"
☐ CC REPRINTED IN THE PHILADELPHIA
☐ Steno INQUIRER.
☐ Clerk

ACTION DESIRED

<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Prepare lead cards
<input type="checkbox"/> Assign Reassign	<input type="checkbox"/> Prepare tickler
<input type="checkbox"/> Bring file	<input type="checkbox"/> Recharge serials
<input type="checkbox"/> Call me	<input type="checkbox"/> Return assignment card
<input type="checkbox"/> Correct	<input type="checkbox"/> Return file
<input type="checkbox"/> Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Return serials
<input type="checkbox"/> Deadline passed	<input type="checkbox"/> Search and return
<input type="checkbox"/> Delinquent	<input type="checkbox"/> See me
<input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue	<input type="checkbox"/> Send Serials
<input type="checkbox"/> Expedite	to
<input type="checkbox"/> File	<input type="checkbox"/> Submit new charge-out
<input type="checkbox"/> Initial & return	<input type="checkbox"/> Submit report by
<input type="checkbox"/> Leads need attention	<input type="checkbox"/> Type
<input type="checkbox"/> Open Case	
<input type="checkbox"/> Return with explanation or notation as to action taken	

Reur Routing Slip, 9/18/59, captioned as above.

Attached herewith is an additional copy of each portion of captioned reprint. One copy of each portion of this reprint has already been forwarded to the Bureau at the time it appeared in THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER.

REGISTERED MAIL

☐ See reverse side

SAC C. E. HENNRICH
 PHILADELPHIA
 Office

gm
Exclusive:

Khrushchev's

Blueprint for Future

'Our

Common

Duty: To

Prevent

War'

Book Reviews

PHILADELPHIA DIVISION

Philadelphia, Pa.

The Philadelphia Inquirer XX
EDITOR: WALTER H. ANNENBERG

The Evening Bulletin
EDITOR: MELVILLE F. FERGUSON

Philadelphia Daily News
EDITOR: J. RAY HUNT

DATE 9/8/59

EDITION Final City

PAGE 1

COLUMN 7-8

TITLE OF CASE SELECTED PORTIONS OF
"KHRUSHCHEV'S BLUEPRINT FOR FUTURE,"
FROM NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV'S BOOK, "FOR
VICTORY IN PEACEFUL COMPETITION WITH
CAPITALISM," REPRINTED IN THE PHILA.
INQUIRER.

62-46855-
NOT RECORDED
57 DEC 8 1959

DEC 11 1959 DR

DATE 9-9-59
Philadelphia Inquirer
Routing Slip

Soviet Union Seeks Normal Ties With West

The Inquirer presents today the first part of selected portions of "Khrushchev's Blueprint for Future," from Nikita S. Khrushchev's first important book, "For Victory in Peaceful Competition with Capitalism," as a public service because it believes all Americans should know how the leader of the USSR thinks, what he believes and what his aims are. Publication in our columns does not in any way constitute approval or confirmation of his views. Copyright, 1959, The Philadelphia Inquirer (A Division of Triangle Publications, Inc.) and Nikita S. Khrushchev. All authorized republications must carry a complete copyright line as a prelude on each article.

Part One

By NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV

MANKIND is threatened with an unprecedented catastrophic war of extermination, a war which, if it breaks out, will take a toll of many millions of lives.

This prospect is particularly absurd today, when science is advancing rapidly, when man has far greater opportunities to ease his toil and employ the world's natural resources to meet the requirements of all the peoples inhabiting our planet.

It is today perfectly possible to ensure progress and prosperity for every country and every nation on the basis of peaceful co-existence, friendly cooperation and mutual assistance between all states.

Today more than ever before, every honest person, and society as a whole, must strive to find ways not only of postponing war, but also of abolishing it forever. This problem cannot be completely solved until mankind has established a society in which there will no longer be rich and poor, in which all will be equal and all derive equal benefit from the blessings of collective labour.

It will be what we call a Communist society. We are convinced that in the long run mankind will build such a social system. But that still requires a great deal of effort, because the peoples are at different stages of development and there are many countries where the forces that would dominate others and live on their labour are still strong.

Our common duty today is to prevent war. If we cannot at the moment abolish it forever, we at least can and should create conditions enabling the peoples to live in peace, without fear that a war of extermination will be launched in accordance with the desires of a few madmen.

The Soviet Union firmly advocates the condemnation and prohibition of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons as a means of mass destruction and urges that they be renounced. We insist on this: we are prepared to conclude an appropriate agreement with other Powers at any time. It is now up to the Governments of the United States and Britain to decide.

We cannot be reconciled to a situation in which everybody is threatened with a terrible atomic war and in which an increasing share of human labour goes to produce weapons of extermination and destruction instead of creating material values and raising standards of living.

We are confident that the peoples will bring greater pressure to bear on those Governments whose policies run counter to the interests of peace, and will in the end make them lend ear to the voice and demands of millions of people and find such a solution as will preclude military catastrophe once and for all.

*From reply to the letter of
C. Rajagopalachari*

Peaceful Co-existence

The Soviet Union and the other socialist states are consistently pursuing a policy of peace and call for the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, for the ending of the arms race that is leading to a new war, and the prohibition of the use, production and testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

As for the economic factor, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries have achieved—and this is no longer denied by anyone—great successes in economic development and are rapidly altering the balance of forces.

in their own favour. In peaceful economic competition we do not doubt in the least that the task set by V. I. Lenin of economically overtaking and surpassing the most advanced capitalist countries—that is to say, in per capita production—will be successfully carried out by the Soviet people.

It can be said that our plans already outline measures for the practical solution of this task. As for the military side of the problem, the successful launching of the Soviet sputniks with the help of the intercontinental ballistic rocket speaks for itself and scarcely needs any extensive comments.

People of various countries differ in their way of life and thinking. Now there are two different systems; there are socialist and capitalist countries. The peoples living in these states have no other alternative but to live peacefully side by side, not to interfere in one another's internal affairs, and respect the opinions of others.

From replies to questions put by V. Sinnbeck, editor of Dansk Folkestyre, a magazine published by the youth organization of the Danish Venstre Party.

The same goes for international affairs. If we succeed in overcoming the stalemate in the current relations between our states, and primarily between the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, France and other countries, if we begin to develop mutually advantageous trade, improve cultural, sports and other ties between the countries, it will have a favourable effect on the improvement of relations between countries as well as on the internal situation in those countries.

A reduction in the armed forces and in expenditures on armaments will create greater possibilities for raising living standards. If we succeed in moving the relations between our countries out of the deadlock in which they now stand, and succeed in turning them towards eliminating the cold war, this alone will be a great thing.

From interview given to A. McDonald, Foreign Editor of The London Times, on Jan. 31, 1958.

The Soviet Union, on the basis of its policy of peace and the principle of peaceful co-existence, is willing to establish normal diplomatic, trade, cultural and other relations with those countries with which, for one reason or another, such relations have not yet been established.

When we speak of peaceful co-existence we have in mind co-existence between the socialist and capitalist

countries. And this not only admits but also presupposes the solution of differences and contradictions between them by means of peaceful competition and, first and foremost, economic competition, or if you like, contest. What does economic competition imply? We understand it as competition in the sphere of civilian production, a contest between the two systems—socialism and capitalism—in making life better for the people, in raising living standards.

What can hinder peaceful co-existence? Here, I think, there can be no two opinions: war and the preparation of war. The cold war, arms drive, propaganda of war, enmity and hatred between nations, trade discrimination and undermining of world commerce—all add to the danger of another devastating war and, consequently, endanger peaceful co-existence between the nations.

You, of course, realize that should the imperialists resort to war, then, in view of the nature of modern armaments, the consequences for the peoples would be calamitous. Nowhere on the globe would the population be sure of being immune from military action, not only armies but peaceful cities and civil population would alike suffer.

We in all sincerity say to capitalist countries, let us compete not to see who can make the largest number of H-bombs and missiles, for that is a competition which bodes no good to the peoples, but to see who can build more houses, schools and hospitals, produce more bread, milk, meat, clothes and other consumer goods. That is the kind of competition the people want. Instead of the slogan "Let us arm!" we proclaim "Let us trade!"

Although the Soviet Union has made significant progress in all spheres, and not least in raising the standard of living of the people, it has set itself the goal of producing more consumer goods than any capitalist country. And we are confident that we shall achieve a still higher standard of living.

How can this endanger peaceful co-existence of nations? The imperialists fear this competition, while we are eager that each system—socialist and capitalist—should demonstrate its superiority not on the war front, but on the front of peaceful labour.

Far from endangering peaceful co-existence, economic competition would, on the contrary, strengthen it, safeguard the nations against the danger of another war and contribute to the improvement of their living conditions in an atmosphere of peace.

From replies to Manuel Mejido, correspondent of the Mexican newspaper Excelsior, Feb. 21, 1958.

Five Principles of Peaceful Co-Existence

The most burning, vital question for all mankind today is the question of peace or war. Wars between states have always caused many casualties and much destruction. But a future war, if, contrary to the will of the peoples, it is unleashed, threatens to be the most destructive of all wars—a nuclear war. Apart from direct destruction, the use of nuclear weapons will contaminate the air by radioactive fall-out, and this can lead to the destruction of all life, especially in countries with densely populated, small territories. There, literally everything can be swept from the face of the earth.

It is precisely for this reason that in our day the struggle to preserve peace and prevent a new war has become not only the primary vital concern of those who may be subjected to attack by the imperialists, but also the immediate concern of the peoples of all countries, regardless of where they may live—in Europe or Asia, America or Africa, irrespective of their class position, religious beliefs or the colour of their skin—it is literally the concern of everyone living on earth.

The task is to prevent a new war and to ensure peace throughout the world. But this needs more than just appeals, more than the desire alone. Peace must be defended in stubborn struggle against the forces that are trying to unleash a new war.

To live without wars, without fear for the morrow, without slavery and poverty, free from the exploitation of some countries by others, free from social injustices—that is what the best minds of mankind and the working people of the whole world have dreamed of for centuries. But only today can these noble dreams become clothed with reality.

This has become possible as a result of the strengthened might of the Soviet Union and the entire world socialist system, that have inaugurated a new epoch in the history of mankind—the epoch of real socialist freedom and the triumph of reason.

I would like to discuss briefly the problem of relations between the USSR and such Western states as France, Britain and the United States, which together with the Soviet Union, the Chinese Peoples Republic and India, bear great responsibility for maintaining universal peace and safeguarding the security of the nations.

We were allies of Britain, France and the United

States during the Second World War and we fought together against Hitler Germany. We respect the peoples of those countries and have a high opinion of the great contribution they made to the development of world science, technology and culture.

Soviet men and women are very well aware that the peoples of those countries, too, are striving for peace. The Soviet Union has exerted, and will continue to exert, every effort to achieve understanding and establish friendly relations with the peoples of those countries and their governments.

In international affairs, in settling existing disputes, they should be guided, not by what divides the world today, but what brings countries closer together in their joint effort to preserve peace.

The only possible foundation for relations between states with different social systems are the well-known Five Principles:

Mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty;

Non-aggression;

Non-interference in one another's internal affairs for economic, political or ideological reasons;

Equality and mutual benefit;

Peaceful co-existence.

The principles of peaceful co-existence, recently approved by the United Nations, should actually be made the cornerstone of relations between all states.

The Soviet Union has stood, and continues to stand for peaceful co-existence, not because it is weak or because it fears threats. If we were not weak before, then today, all the more so, we have everything necessary to protect the peaceful labours of the Soviet people and to smash any aggressor, should he try to attack our country.

We are sure that the great ideas of Communism will triumph, but we have never imposed upon other countries by force of arms the socialist way of life and our ideology, nor do we intend to do so. The Soviet people want to live in peace and friendship with all other peoples.

From the speech at a meeting of Electors of Kalinin constituency, Moscow, on March 14, 1958.

Wednesday: Part II—
'The Meaning of Peaceful Co-existence.'

gm

'Meaning of Peaceful Co- Existence'

2

Book Reviews

PHILADELPHIA DIVISION

Philadelphia, Pa.

The Philadelphia Inquirer - Xx
EDITOR: WALTER H. ANNENBERG

The Evening Bulletin
EDITOR: MELVILLE F. FERGUSON

Philadelphia Daily News
EDITOR: J. RAY HUNT

DATE 9/9/59

EDITION Star

PAGE 1

COLUMN 7-8

TITLE OF CASE SELECTED PORTIONS OF
"KHRUSHCHEV'S BLUEPRINT FOR FUTURE,"
FROM NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV'S BOOK, "FOR
VICTORY IN PEACEFUL COMPETITION WITH
CAPITALISM."

162-46855-A
NOT RECORDED
47 DEC 8 1959

'Not Necessary For Capitalism to Drop Ideology'

The *Inquirer* presents today the second part of selected portions of "Khrushchev's Blueprint for Future," from Nikita S. Khrushchev's first important book, "For Victory in Peaceful Competition with Capitalism," as a public service because it believes all Americans should know how the leader of the USSR thinks, what he believes and what his aims are. Publication in our columns does not in any way constitute approval or confirmation of his views. Copyright, 1959, The Philadelphia Inquirer (A Division of Triangle Publications, Inc.) and Nikita S. Khrushchev. All authorized republications must carry a complete copyright line as a prelude on each article.

Part Two

By NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV

OUR point of view regarding the nature of inter-state relations between the socialist and capitalist countries has been set forth a number of times. The gist of it, in brief, is, first, that the form of state organization and the form of social organization of any particular country must be decided by the people of that country themselves; secondly, that no state or any external forces can or should impose on other nations their way of life or their political or social system; thirdly, since man's social development takes place along an ascending line, it inevitably gives rise to new forms of life for society.

Consequently, the appearance of states with a socialist system, as a result of the operation of the objective laws of social development, is just as natural as was, in its day, the appearance of bourgeois states; and lastly, in order to rid mankind of devastating wars and, in particular, of the threat of the most destructive war ever known by humanity—nuclear war—we feel that the principle of peaceful co-existence and cooperation must prevail in relations between the socialist and capitalist states.

What does this principle mean in practice? It does not demand that the capitalist states renounce their existing system or ideology. Naturally, acceptance of this principle will not lead to the immediate elimination of disputes and contradictions that are inevitable under conditions when different states exist.

But this principle demands that the states, in settling outstanding issues between them, should renounce the use of force in any form, including military force, and seek the peaceful settlement of possible conflicts respecting the mutual interests of the parties concerned. Peaceful co-existence also presupposes the complete and unqualified non-interference of states in the internal affairs of one another with a view to changing their system or way of life, or for any other reason.

I think that the meaning given to the term peaceful co-existence will now be clearer to you. As you see, we stand for a healthy and realistic basis for relations between states with different social systems. The principle of peaceful co-existence does not place any individual state or any group of states at an advantage over other states and does not infringe on anyone's interests; it is of benefit to all who desire peace, not in words, but in deeds.

From replies to questions put by John Waters, editor of the Melbourne Herald, June 11, 1958

Differences in Views Should Not Lead to War. Principle of Non-Interference

The Soviet Union stands for the establishment of friendly relations with all countries regardless of their social and political systems, and we see no obstacle to the broadest development of all types of contact between the socialist and capitalist countries. We do not, however, close our eyes to the fact that there are bound to be points of difference or, as you term them, clashes of opinions and interests, between the socialist and capitalist countries.

But we consider that these differences and clashes should not lead to war. It must not be forgotten that in our age, the age of atomic energy and inter-continental rockets, any country which attempts to settle international disputes by force of arms hazards its own existence by so doing. Those in the West who do not want to understand this and who still console themselves with hopes about the

power of aircraft carriers and bombs are thinking in terms of the last century. Only political maniacs and suicides can consider war as a means of settling international disputes and differences.

The only rational way of settling international differences and disagreements is through negotiations and mutually acceptable agreements which take into account the interests of all the parties concerned.

As I have already said, the socialist countries consistently adhere to the principles of peaceful co-existence. But for peace to triumph, the policy of peaceful co-existence should be recognized and pursued, if not by all, then at least by the majority of countries, and above all by those upon whose policy the question of peace or war depends.

The rulers of the United States, Britain and their partners must renounce their policy from "positions of strength" and their claims for domination over other countries. The sooner the illusions and emotions of the Western Powers give place to reality and common sense, the better it will be for everybody and for world peace.

As regards the ideological differences between the capitalist and socialist countries, it is today nothing short of madness to attempt to impose one's own ideological opinions on others by force of arms.

We are fully convinced that in life's disputes those views and conceptions will triumph which most faithfully reflect the objective laws of mankind's social development and the requirements not of the minority, but of the majority of people. In our opinion, Marxism-Leninism is such an ideology. Reality day by day and hour by hour continues to confirm its correctness.

Non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries is one of the basic principles to which our country adheres in its foreign policy. Every people is master in its own house, and it alone has the right to decide what shall be its internal system.

We resolutely condemn the use of the diktat in international relations. The principle of non-interference in the affairs of other countries must be observed by all countries, not only in words, but in deeds.

From replies to questions put by Murilo Marroquim de Souza, Brazilian journalist, on Oct. 3, 1958

Relations Between East and West. Let Us Improve Our Relations And Strengthen Peace

We have always said and continue to say now: Let us improve our relations, let us trade, let us develop scientific, cultural and sports contacts. Let us meet and discuss pressing international problems in a businesslike manner. We have proposed and we propose now that an end be put to the cold war and the arms race, that the "policy of strength" be renounced, that the policy of intimidation by war be abandoned, and that our relations be built on the basis of peaceful co-existence.

The Soviet Government is ready to discuss any questions designed to strengthen peace and establish greater confidence among the states, to discuss these questions with its partners.

Mr. Eisenhower, for instance, recently put forward in one of his speeches the idea of pooling the efforts of the Soviet Union and the United States to combat such scourges of mankind as cancer, tuberculosis and malaria. We believe that one can agree with this. One could list many other questions, such as the struggle against poliomyelitis, locusts, glanders and foot-and-mouth disease. We are successfully co-operating with Iran and Afghanistan in combating locusts. There are many other matters regarding which, far from hindering co-operation, we are doing our utmost to extend it. Although not all these problems are acute or dangerous to our country, we are nevertheless ready to co-operate with countries where such problems are particularly pressing. We shall be pleased to pool our efforts with those of other countries in solving such problems.

From the speech on "Some Aspects of International Situation" made at the conference of front-tank workers in agriculture of the Byelorussian Republic on Jan. 22, 1958

Co-operation Leads to Consolidation of the Cause of Peace

It may safely be said that although certain circles in the imperialist countries are clinging frantically to the bankrupt "positions of strength" policy, the prospects for the relaxation of international tension and the development of economic co-operation and scientific and cultural exchanges between countries with different social systems have now become more favourable.

Take, for instance, the agreement on the development of cultural contacts concluded between the Soviet Union and the U. S. A. It is a big step forward. The socialist countries have made definite progress in the development of cultural contacts with the capitalist countries.

Indeed, every socialist country is doing its utmost to extend cultural relations with other countries, the Polish People's Republic among others, having done much in this direction. One can only welcome this development of co-operation, this strengthening of friendly ties between peoples, for it leads to better understanding and the consolidation of the cause of peace.

It is well known that the socialist countries have established economic ties with many capitalist countries. Recently, business circles in capitalist countries have been making more frequent statements in favour of the extension of these contacts. Today there are few people in the West who believe in the efficacy of the bankrupt policy of economically blockading the socialist countries.

The world socialist economy is able to produce everything needed for its further development, and no bans imposed by the ruling circles of certain countries on trade with the socialist countries can prevent us from continuing to advance as successfully as we are now doing.

If anyone stands to lose from these prohibitions, it is the business circles of the Western Powers. Their interests call for the extension of trade with the socialist countries. For our part, we also welcome the expansion of trade between the socialist and the capitalist countries.

The socialist countries have always stood for the all-around development of economic relations with all the

other countries. It goes without saying that these relations must be based on the strictest observance of equality, mutual advantage and non-interference in internal affairs.

*From replies to questions put by Trybuna Ludu
on March 10, 1958*

Peaceful Co-Existence Is Hard Reality

We considered, and still consider, that ideological differences are in no way an obstacle to the development of mutually profitable trade between socialist and capitalist countries.

I would recall that even in the early 1920s many Western countries, because of economic expediency and despite ideological differences, established trade relations with the Soviet Union. Since then trade between the Soviet Union and capitalist countries, except for certain relatively brief interruptions, has continued to develop steadily.

In 1957, for instance, our trade with capitalist countries increased (at comparable prices) approximately two-fold as compared with 1938. But can this growth be considered adequate and corresponding to the interests of the development of world trade? No, it cannot. We are ready for a further extension of trade, but certain circles in the Western countries—those who are interested in the continuation of the cold war—are using the existing ideological differences as a pretext to justify their unwillingness to develop normal trade relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

If the principles of peaceful co-existence are adhered to, then no ideological differences, though they do of course exist, should prevent the development and broadening of mutually profitable economic ties. Peaceful co-existence is a hard reality whose significance in international relations is growing. Trade constitutes that sound and stable basis upon which co-existence between countries with different social and economic systems can successfully develop and be consolidated.

I think you will agree with me that trade has a more than economic significance. Trade is the most normal way of establishing good relations between countries.

Trade and economic ties create a good basis for the consolidation of international political relations.

The Soviet Union today has trade treaty relations with 45 countries: with all the socialist countries, almost all the countries of Western Europe, including Britain, France, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, Greece, Sweden, etc., with the majority of Asian and African countries, including India, Indonesia, Japan, Iran, Afghanistan, Burma, the United Arab Republic, and many others. We also have trade agreements with two countries of the American continent—Canada and Argentina.

With a number of countries we have agreements which provide for the development of exchange on the basis of agreed lists of commodities for reciprocal deliveries.

Many Western countries are showing an interest in the development of trade with the Soviet Union on the basis of long-term agreements. That is why the Soviet Union has in recent years concluded long-term agreements on reciprocal deliveries with a number of capitalist countries, for instance, a five-year agreement with Finland and long-term agreements with Norway, Iceland and Denmark.

In 1957 alone we concluded such long-term agreements with France, Italy, Austria, Afghanistan and Iran. Negotiations are in progress on a long-term agreement between the USSR and the Federal Republic of Germany. All these agreements provide for a substantial increase in trade.

The United States of America is now the only Great Power and one of the few countries of the world with which the Soviet Union does not have trade treaty relations. If the Government of the United States expresses a desire to conclude a trade treaty or agreement with the USSR, I can assure you of a favourable response from the Soviet side.

We advocate the lifting of all restrictions and bans on trade between the capitalist and the socialist countries not only because we hope it would promote the establishment of confidence in the relations between all nations and bring about a relaxation of international tension, but also because discriminatory restrictions lead to uncertainty in commerce and mistrust between the partners in trade. Connected as you are with business circles, you should know full well how much confidence means in commerce and how adversely its absence affects the development of trade.

We are in favour of selling what we can sell and of buying what we want to buy, and we want our partners to be able to sell and buy what they want. And the things which either you or we cannot sell should not be a subject for reciprocal claims.

We were able to meet only on the 22nd of March. This is the day of spring. It would be gratifying if you could become the first swallows of spring in business relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, so that trade might develop on a more extensive scale and all the talk of military preparations and about who has more rockets, bombs and other means of annihilating people could stop.

The war preparations distress and horrify people. The nations do not want war. It would be much better if we adopted different attitudes in our relations, and talked about the number of machines and other goods you could sell us and the quantity of machines or other goods and raw materials you could buy from us. Is that a bad objective?

We are in favour of visits by more American manufacturers and businessmen whom we could acquaint with our production, and of visits to the U. S. A. by our workers in the field of industrial production. This would be useful for the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. People are indeed tired of reports about rockets, hydrogen and atomic explosions, and bombers.

Our sincere desire is that your visit to our country—a visit by the representatives of the most far-sighted American business circles—should serve as a starting-point for good and friendly relations with the United States of America. We could only welcome this.

From interview given to Eric Ridder, owner and publisher of Journal of Commerce, and its editor, Heinz Luedicke, March 22, 1958

Thursday: Part III—
'Meetings... Will Lead to a Solution'

PM
3
Meetings

Will Lead

to

Solution

Book Reviews

PHILADELPHIA DIVISION

Philadelphia, Pa.

The Philadelphia Inquirer XX
EDITOR: WALTER H. ANNENBERG

The Evening Bulletin
EDITOR: MELVILLE F. FERGUSON

Philadelphia Daily News
EDITOR: J. RAY HUNT

DATE 9/10/59

EDITION Final City

PAGE 1

COLUMN 7-8

TITLE OF CASE SELECTED PORTIONS OF
"KHRUSHCHEV'S BLUEPRINT FOR FUTURE,"
FROM NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV'S BOOK, "FOR
VICTORY IN PEACEFUL COMPETITION WITH
CAPITALISM."

RECEIVED
DATED 9-9-59
FROM Philadelphia Enquirer
MARKED FILE AND INITIALED

62-46855-A
NOT RECORDED
SEP 11 1959

Daring Search, Concerted Effort Needed in World

The Inquirer presents today the third part of selected portions of "Khrushchev's Blueprint for Future," from Nikita S. Khrushchev's first important book, "For Victory in Peaceful Competition with Capitalism," as a public service because it believes all Americans should know how the leader of the USSR thinks, what he believes and what his aims are. Publication in our columns does not in any way constitute approval or confirmation of his views. Copyright, 1959, The Philadelphia Inquirer (A Division of Triangle Publications, Inc.) and Nikita S. Khrushchev. All authorized republications must carry a complete copyright line as a precedent on each article.

Part Three

By NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV

BUT the fact is that the leaders who now stand at the helm of the leading NATO member-states refuse to take the road of peaceful co-existence, refuse to renounce the policy of cold war. This is the reason why the so greatly needed turning point in the development of international events towards the normalization of the international atmosphere has not as yet been reached.

However, we are now living not in the 18th, and not even in the 19th century, when some rulers or other could ignore the will of the peoples, although it must be said that even in those times that was far from safe to do. In our days hundreds of millions of people in all countries have found their way to active political life and hardly anyone would be able to ignore indefinitely the will of the peoples for peace.

Already at the present time the more farsighted political leaders of the capitalist world have realized the need for radical changes in method and approach to the solution of international problems. True, assurances are also not rarely heard from those leaders of the Western Powers who shape the policy of military blocs of their peaceable intentions and readiness to settle international problems by negotiation. But real intentions are gauged, not by words, but by deeds. If we look at the policy of the Western Powers from this angle, we shall obtain a totally different picture.

From speech "The Resistance of Forces Obstructing Improvement of International Climate and Peaceful Co-existence" at Meeting of Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty, May 24, 1958.

Daring Search Is Needed

We should like to hope that the leaders of the United States of America, for their part, might take a more sober view of things. A solution of the contradictions dividing the states of the East and the West does not lie in an arms race, but rather in negotiations between them. It is not sabre-rattling but meetings between responsible statesmen that will lead to a solution of controversial issues.

In the present circumstances, with the cold war outgrowths that have accumulated over the years making themselves felt literally at every point, a daring search and a concerted and determined effort are needed to secure a turn in international relations which the peoples desire, and to spare the world the nightmare of a war catastrophe.

It can hardly be disputed that only a conference of the most authoritative and plenipotentiary representatives of states can tackle this task. This is precisely why the Soviet Union, upon consulting all the socialist countries, made a proposal last December for a top-level East-West conference.

The Soviet Government has done everything in its power to clear the way to a conference at the summit and to create an atmosphere of confidence and businesslike cooperation.

The Soviet Union has demonstrated by deeds its peacefulness and its sincere desire to provide conditions for a firm and lasting peace. The Soviet Government, without awaiting an international agreement on disarmament, has unilaterally reduced its armed forces repeatedly in recent years.

In 1955 it reduced them by 640,000 men and in 1956-57 by another 1,200,000. At present, a further reduction,

by 300,000 is nearing completion, with considerable cuts effected in our troops temporarily stationed under existing agreements in the German Democratic Republic and Hungary.

Our country's armaments, military equipment and expenditures for defense have been reduced accordingly.

The other member countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization reduced their armed forces by a total of over 337,000 in the course of 1955-57.

We all give due recognition to the great contribution made to the maintenance of peace by the great Chinese People's Republic, which recently decided to withdraw the Chinese Volunteers from Korea. If the United States following the example of People's China withdrew its troops from South Korea and dismantled all its bases there, this would unquestionably help to strengthen peace in the Far East and to solve the Korean problem.

We say to the capitalist countries: Let us compete in the manufacture of goods and articles which the peoples need to make their life fuller and happier, let us compete in advancing the living standards and well-being of the peoples. And let the peoples themselves decide during this competition for the benefit of man which road coincides more with their interests.

The socialist states do not fear peaceful competition with the capitalist countries, for they are deeply confident of its outcome.

From speech "The Socialist Countries Are in Favour of Stopping Arms Race and Cold War" at Meeting of Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty, May 24, 1958.

People Desire to Live in Peace

All nations desire to live in peace and friendship and wish to be delivered, once and for all, from fears preying upon the minds of their people for their future and that of their dear ones. They wish to bring about a situation in which the vast sums now being spent on armaments could be used for the good of mankind, to raise their living standards, to develop the national economy and culture, and so on. Such conditions can be secured only by gradually achieving normal relations between states, and this requires, above all, the settlement of those questions which hinder an understanding between states.

What are these issues? Frankly speaking, this involves problems resulting from the Western Powers' pursuance of the policy of cold war and "positions of strength." At the present time, the best way to deal with questions which are ripe for settlement is through a conference of leading statesmen, that is to say, a summit conference. We are convinced that, given the desire on the part of both sides, such a conference could discover ways of solving urgent international problems.

From replies to questions put by John Waters, editor of the Melbourne Herald, June 11, 1958.

Mutually Beneficial Basis Must Be Found

Our Government has recently received from large

firms in Western countries many offers to deliver equipment for the Soviet Union's chemical industry. Such proposals, for instance, have been received from industrialists in West Germany, Britain, France and the United States. We are now studying all these offers with a view to concluding satisfactory contracts.

Here we are really acting on the basis of mutual benefit. The capitalists enter into business contacts only when it is to their advantage. We, for our part, want to do business with capitalist firms, which is advantageous to our country. So it is necessary to find a basis which is mutually beneficial to both parties and then sign business contracts.

The capitalist businessmen must be ensured a legitimate percentage of profit. Here we cannot count on friendly, unselfish assistance. There is no capitalist who would not strive to obtain bigger returns to profit from any business transaction.

We have proposed to the Government of the United States that an agreement be concluded for the delivery of chemical equipment to our country and that appropriate credits be granted in this connection. But so far we have received no reply from the United States. It is apparently very difficult for the United States Government to reply to our proposals. But we are in no hurry about this—we

shall wait. Furthermore, if we do wait, that does not mean we are doing nothing. We are waiting for an answer, but we ourselves are working on the problem of speeding up the development of our chemical industry with our own resources.

From speech at the meeting held in the Palace of Culture of the Bitterfeld Electro-Chemical Works during the stay in the German Democratic Republic of the delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 5th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, July 9, 1958.

What Is In the Way to Relaxation Of International Tension

The Soviet Government has recently published its proposals on the questions being put forward for consideration by a conference of Heads of Government. The Soviet Government is again proposing a discussion on the more important international problems which are ripe for solution and which, given the good will of all parties, can already be settled at the present time.

But how are the Western Powers responding to the peace moves of the Soviet Union? What practical con-

tribution have they made to ease international tension? Unfortunately it must be said that the attitude adopted by the Western Powers by no means provides evidence of their readiness to help create a favourable atmosphere for a summit meeting.

The flights of American planes, loaded with hydrogen bombs, towards the frontiers of the Soviet Union, the policy of nuclear arms race, the arming of the West German Bundeswehr with atomic weapons, the stubborn refusal to follow the USSR's example in ending tests of atomic and hydrogen bombs, the creation of atomic and rocket bases aimed against the socialist countries—all this hinders the preparation of a summit conference and prevents the easing of international tension.

The Western Powers are dragging out such issues as cannot be settled, because the conditions are not yet ripe, or such as do not at all come within the competence of a summit meeting.

From speech at the 5th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, July 11, 1958

Peaceful and Tranquil Life Must Be Won for People

What makes us interested in negotiations with the Western Powers?

It would be futile to look for reasons in the situation within the socialist camp. Our camp is homogeneous and united as never before. We discuss our internal matters in our own fraternal circle, without outsiders. We are well able to solve all matters helping to consolidate further the socialist states and to expedite the development of their economy and culture. We have no difficulties in that domain, nor do we foresee any.

It would also be futile to look for reasons for our interest in negotiations with the Western Powers in the internal situation of the Soviet Union. That is simply absurd. The stability of our international position is based on the close solidarity of our peoples, the steady development of our economy, science, technology and culture.

The weight of the three artificial earth satellites placed in orbit by the Soviet Union is a symbol of our country's weight in international affairs. Yet this is only a beginning. The Soviet giant circling our planet is only a pathfinder blazing the trail for still greater successes of Soviet science and technology.

The Soviet Union's interest in negotiating with the Western Powers is not to be explained by internal reasons or our international position, but by human, universal considerations, by the fact that we stand firmly for the peaceful coexistence of states with different social and political systems. We want to remove the danger of a destructive war, to deliver the people from constant fear of a new military conflict, and to win them a peaceful and tranquil life.

From speech at Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship meeting of Moscow working people, July 12, 1958

Friday: Part IV—'U.S.S.R. Opposes
Colonialization'

Soviet Union Opposes Colonial ism

Book Reviews

PHILADELPHIA DIVISION

Philadelphia, Pa.

The Philadelphia Inquirer XX
EDITOR: WALTER H. ANNENBERG

The Evening Bulletin
EDITOR: MELVILLE F. FERGUSON

Philadelphia Daily News
EDITOR: J. RAY HUNT

DATE 9/11/59

EDITION Star

PAGE 1

COLUMN 7-8

TITLE OF CASE SELECTED PORTIONS OF
"KHRUSHCHEV'S BLUEPRINT FOR FUTURE,"
FROM NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV'S BOOK,
"FOR VICTORY IN PEACEFUL COMPETITION
WITH CAPITALISM."

TOP CLIPPING
DATED 9-9-59
FROM Philadelphia Enquirer
MARKED FILE AND INITIALED
Routing Slip

62-46845-A
NOT RECORDED
EX-108

'No Privileges Are Sought by Socialist Camp'

The Inquirer presents today the fourth part of selected portions of "Khrushchev's Blueprint for Future," from Nikita S. Khrushchev's first important book, "For Victory in Peaceful Competition with Capitalism," as a public service because it believes all Americans should know how the leader of the USSR thinks, what he believes and what his aims are. Publication in our columns does not in any way constitute approval or confirmation of his views. Copyright, 1959, The Philadelphia Inquirer (A Division of Triangle Publications, Inc.) and Nikita S. Khrushchev. All authorized republications must carry a complete copyright line as a prelude on each article.

Part Four

By NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV

BOURGEOIS ideologists assert that the formation and strengthening of the socialist camp restricts the independence and national sovereignty of the countries that belong to it. The entire practice of the development of co-operation among the socialist countries since the world socialist system was formed, convincingly shows that it is precisely socialism that brings to the peoples genuine state independence.

The socialist camp is a voluntary union of equal and sovereign states in which no one seeks or strives for any special rights, privileges or advantages for himself. It goes without saying that each socialist country independently decides the question of the forms of its cooperation with the other socialist countries. There is not and cannot be any compulsion in this matter.

But is it possible for the sake of victory of socialism, to make full use of the rich possibilities possessed by the socialist countries, if each of them acts alone and "stews in its own juice," so to speak? Is it possible, in the present international conditions, to ensure the reliable defense of the gains of socialism, if the socialist countries act in an uncoordinated way? Of course not.

It is only the unity of the socialist countries that ensures the maximum utilization of the advantages of the world socialist system and enhances its strength and might in the struggle to prevent a new war, and in the economic competition with capitalism. Life has convincingly demonstrated that the strengthening of the unity of the countries of the socialist camp, far from infringing the national interests of any of these countries, is a reliable guarantee of their national independence and sovereignty.

The Communist and Workers' Parties unanimously agree that only the unity of the socialist countries and the strengthening of all-round cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance based on the great principles of proletarian internationalism ensure the common advance of the socialist economy and the raising of the formerly backward countries to the level of the advanced ones, and make it possible to abolish the existing inequality in economic and cultural development which they have inherited from the past.

The cohesion of the countries of the socialist camp is ensured, above all, by the unity of the Communist and Workers' Parties—a unity based on the unshakable principles of Marxism-Leninism, tried and tested by the experience of history. By creatively applying the general principles of Marxism-Leninism, each party works out the most expedient concrete forms for embodying these principles in the conditions of its own country, and thereby makes its contribution to the theory and practice of socialist construction, to the development of Marxism-Leninism.

From speech at the 7th Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party on June 3, 1958

The Soviet Union Is An Irreconcilable Opponent of the Shameful System Of Colonialism

Today, we see how more than 1500 million people in Africa and Asia have taken the road of independence. In some places the colonial Powers, forced under pressure of the national liberation movement to recognize the fol-

nal independence of one or another country, still retain a strong economic grip on them. But this will not be the case for long.

Having attained political independence, these young countries are beginning to build their own economies, enhancing their economic independence of the foreign monopolies. True, this process is taking place not without struggle and not without difficulties, but ultimately these countries will triumph over the difficulties.

The Soviet Union deeply sympathizes with all the nations striving to win and uphold their independence. And these nations can rest assured that the Soviet Union, without any meddling in their internal affairs, without stipulating any conditions will help them to strengthen the independence for which they fought so hard.

In the economic sphere, for example, they no longer need bow before their former enslavers. They can now get industrial plant, machinery and technical documents in mutually favourable conditions from the socialist countries. Our country has already extended disinterested help to the Afro-Asian nations in developing their economies and culture, and, what is more, help without any political or military strings.

From replies to Manuel Mejido, correspondent of the Mexican newspaper Excelsior, on Feb. 21, 1958.

THE Soviet Union is an irreconcilable opponent of the shameful system of colonialism and gives support to all peoples who are fighting for their national liberation, for the strengthening of their national independence. We know with what difficulty the new is born. The old forces not only do not want to recognize the new, but do everything possible to nip it in the bud.

The Great October Socialist Revolution struck a powerful blow at the entire system of imperialism and colonialism. The past 40 years have seen tremendous changes throughout the world. The defeat of the aggressors in the Second World War, the victory of the People's Liberation Revolution in China, the formation of a whole group of socialist states in Europe and Asia—all this dealt another crushing blow at imperialism. One colonial empire after another began to tumble down, and more and more independent states are emerging in the world.

The Soviet people rejoice at the liberation of the peoples of Asia and Africa from the yoke of colonialism. We, for our part, are ready to do everything to facilitate the complete liberation of the colonial and dependent countries.

While establishing friendly relations with other countries, we have never forced on them, nor do we want to force on them, our system of government, nor do we aim to derive privileges or any special material benefits.

Our people are used to earning their own living; we respect the labour of all peoples and believe that every man and woman and all nations have the right to dispose of the fruits of their work and of the wealth of their country.

From speech at the meeting of friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic on May 15, 1958.

The Colonialist Policy of Imperialists Is Tottering and Breaking Up

These are good times in which we are living. As during a great spring flood, the ice is now breaking up, everything is blossoming, everything is moving ahead in its historical development. The age-old ice of the colonial regime also has cracked and is breaking up before our eyes in quite a number of countries. The peoples are casting off and are breaking the chains of colonialism.

In vain are the efforts of those who would like to curb the liberation struggle of the peoples who have risen against age-old colonial oppression. As the spring waters break the winter ice on frozen rivers, so the peoples of the colonial countries and imperialist dependencies are breaking the hateful order established in their countries by alien enslavers. The colonialist policy of the imperialists is tottering and breaking up and this drives them to violent fury.

We revolutionaries, followers of Marx, Engels and

Lenin, rejoice that the colonial peoples have risen in resolute struggle against their oppressors, against the colonialists and that they wish to be masters of their own destiny. We hail their movement, sympathize with them in their liberation struggle and want to do everything to help them achieve their legitimate and noble aim—the liberation of their countries and national independence. We wish the peoples of these countries to be masters of their own national wealth, that these peoples ensure for themselves a state structure in their own countries dictated by their national interests.

The Arab peoples who have risen in resolute struggle against imperialism are waging this struggle not under the Marxist banner, but under the colours of the national liberation movement. How they will order their life afterwards is their own affair. We greet them as they are today—fighters against colonialism, against imperialism, who demand that the jackboots of the alien invader should not trample upon their soil.

From speech at embassy reception of the Polish Republic of the 14th anniversary of the Day of National Renaissance on July 22, 1953

The Colonialists Will Surely Fail To Halt This Struggle

The struggle for liberation from colonial dependence is a matter of life and death for the colonial peoples. But those who are accustomed to being colonialists do not want to understand that at all. Moreover, at times it is not understood even by people who consider themselves progressive and free-thinking, and who condemn violence. They have become accustomed to a situation in which the imperialists of this or that Western state lord it over a number of countries of Asia, Africa and South America by virtue of being more "developed and highly civilized," as if destined to fulfill a "noble mission," to "bring civilization and culture" to the peoples of underdeveloped countries.

Such explanations are untenable. There are no arguments, nor can there be, to justify the preservation and continuation of the policy of colonialism.

And today, when people boast that in Britain and in some other Western countries the standard of living is higher than in other countries, we must not forget at whose

expense this has been achieved. It became possible at the expense of the millions of people who were sacrificed to attain that high level.

How many millions have died and are still dying today in colonial countries so that colonialists may be able to make huge fortunes out of the blood, poverty and suffering of the peoples. It is not civilization and culture that the colonialists bring to the countries dependent upon them, but oppression, violence, poverty, backwardness and enslavement.

THE imperialists who extract oil and other wealth, practically for nothing, from the colonial and dependent countries, ignore the fact that owing to this, millions upon millions of people—children and adults—perish in those countries. This does not disturb them in the least. They say that the Asian and African peoples have always lived in greater poverty, and fared worse than the population in the Western countries.

Can the peoples of Asia and Africa reconcile themselves to such prospects? They are fighting, and will continue to fight, for their independence, for the right to dispose of their countries' wealth themselves. The peoples of Asia and Africa are waging a determined struggle for the national independence of their countries. The colonialists will not be able to halt this struggle. It began despite the wishes of the colonialists and it will reach a successful conclusion.

As for relations between the socialist countries, on the one hand, and the former colonial countries and the colonial countries which are liberating themselves, on the other, here there is complete clarity. It is necessary to strengthen in every way the relations between these countries, both along governmental lines and along social lines. To exchange delegations, to render each other assistance in economic and cultural matters and in the development of industry.

Economically highly developed countries should help the underdeveloped countries to enable the peoples of those countries to utilize the available possibilities for promoting their economy, culture and science and for raising the standard of living of the population. I think that relations of just such a kind are developing at the present time. In the future, too, they should develop in the same direction.

I believe that all socialist countries understand their

role precisely in the following way: To help one another, to help the socialist countries, and at the same time also to help the countries which are throwing off, or have already thrown off, the colonial yoke; not to interfere in the internal affairs of those countries, but to help them in their development, in the consolidation of national independence and sovereignty.

ACCORDINGLY, it is always necessary to be guided by the well-known Five Principles which are now recognized by many countries: Mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in one another's affairs, equality and mutual benefit, peaceful coexistence and economic cooperation. Such a development of relations provides the only correct way. It will promote the strengthening of the forces of progress, the strengthening of friendly relations between countries, and, consequently, it will help to ensure lasting peace.

As for my wishes for the Indian people, they have always been, and they remain, most sincere and open-hearted. First of all I heartily wish that the people of India may enjoy all the fruits of the independence India has won in her struggle against the colonialists. It is our wish that India may develop her economy, because independence can only be retained when the national economy is developed to a high level, making it possible to provide abundantly for the needs of the people.

If we do not achieve a solution to the problem of universal disarmament, a country must possess the means to defend its freedom and independence.

If colonialists were to attempt to re-establish their colonial domination in your country, you would not tolerate that, would you? In order to retain the national independence which many countries have now achieved, after having driven out the colonialists, they should develop their national economy in every possible way.

From interview with Indian journalists, July 29, 1958.

We Are in Favour of Real Economic Assistance

The press in Western states devoted much space to the need for rendering economic aid to underdeveloped countries. We are in favour of such assistance. Let us compete in this field. But such aid must be rendered as to enable the country assisted to really develop its economy and to rid itself of dependence on economically stronger countries, actually ensuring its independence. It is precisely such assistance that the underdeveloped countries need.

If underdeveloped countries are to be helped, this must be done in a way to enable them to increase their economic potential, in order to strengthen these states, and help them stand on their own feet. But the imperialists cannot accept this because it contradicts the essence of imperialism.

The imperialists have pumped tremendous wealth out of the colonial and dependent countries. Let them return at least a portion of what they have plundered. They are under obligation to do this.

Our country has taken no hand in colonial plunder. From the moment Soviet power was proclaimed Lenin declared that our state was vigorously opposed to the imperialist colonial policy, the enslavement and oppression of some countries by others. And our state has undeviatingly carried out and will continue to carry out such a policy.

As for the Soviet Union, it has helped and will continue to help underdeveloped countries disinterestedly, by lending direct assistance. We come to terms on an honest basis with those countries which need such assistance. As everyone can see, our assistance therefore fundamentally differs from that "aid" which the imperialists are rendering underdeveloped countries.

There is no force on earth which could halt the movement of the peoples fighting for their independence, for their liberation.

From speech at reception by Vice President of the United Arab Republic, Marshal Abdul Hakim Amer, on Oct. 21, 1958

Saturday: Part V—Ready to Agree to Disarmament

gm

Ready to Agree to Disarm ament

5

Book Reviews

PHILADELPHIA DIVISION

Philadelphia, Pa.

The Philadelphia Inquirer XX
EDITOR: WALTER H. ANNENBERG

The Evening Bulletin
EDITOR: MELVILLE F. FERGUSON

Philadelphia Daily News
EDITOR: J. RAY HUNT

DATE 9/12/59

EDITION Final City

PAGE 1

COLUMN 7-8

TITLE OF CASE SELECTED PORTIONS OF
"KHRUSHCHEV'S BLUEPRINT FOR FUTURE,"
FROM NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV'S BOOK, "FOR
VICTORY IN PEACEFUL COMPETITION WITH
CAPITALISM."

9-9-59
ON Philadelphia Enquirer
MAKED FILE NEW MATERIAL
Routing Slip

62-46855-A
8

'Why Not Go From Words to Deeds?' He Asks

The Inquirer presents today the fifth part of selected portions of "Khrushchev's Blueprint for Future," from Nikita S. Khrushchev's first important book, "For Victory in Peaceful Competition with Capitalism," as a public service because it believes all Americans should know how the leader of the USSR thinks, what he believes and what his aims are. Publication in our columns does not in any way constitute approval or confirmation of his views. Copyright, 1959, The Philadelphia Inquirer (A Division of Triangle Publications, Inc.) and Nikita S. Khrushchev. All authorized republications must carry a complete copyright line as a prelude on each article.

Part Five

By NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV

WE ARE ready to agree to the complete banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons, to a complete disarmament, to a complete withdrawal of troops and the closing-down of foreign bases on the territories of other states. We know that our partners are not prepared for such a solution and for this reason we have proposed that these problems be solved gradually by stages. As regards the stage our partners are ready to go to, you must ask them; we do not know. As for us, we are prepared to discuss and solve disarmament problems in their broadest aspect.

To make my point more clear I would say the following: The doctors at first treat a man emaciated by a grave illness gradually and prescribe food for him in small doses. If more were given the patient, it might kill him. And so we want to begin disarmament not with a full dose, although we are prepared even for a full dose. I have said already that the Western Powers have shown great distrust of us and we, too, do not trust them in everything. And so, in order not to wreck something of great and vital importance to mankind—disarmament—we suggest beginning not with a cardinal but with a gradual solution of disarmament problems, beginning with what offers hope, inspires confidence. Thus, step by step, gradually, it would be possible to reach the main goal, that is, the full solution of the problem.

From interview given to A. McDonald, Foreign Editor of The London Times, on Jan. 13, 1958.

It Is Necessary to Go From Words to Deeds

We have often declared and here again declare that the Soviet Union is most sincerely striving to do everything that lies within its power to avert events which can lead to atomic war, the consequences of which will be catastrophic for all countries.

Thus, so far as the desire to avert the danger of atomic war is concerned, our positions seemingly coincide. What, then, is the matter? Why not go from words to deeds, and make it possible for the peoples to breathe, freed from the danger of a new world conflagration which hangs over them like the sword of Damocles? Why not enable the world—to quote your good words, Professor Russell—"to live again in a noonday brightness of hope"?

The Soviet Union is ready to settle the disarmament problem as quickly as is practically possible in the interests of peace and security of the peoples. We have supported and still do support a fundamental solution of the disarmament problem; we have been and still are in favour of the complete and unconditional prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the ending of their production and testing, the destruction of all existing stockpiles, and a substantial reduction in armed forces, armaments and military expenditures—all with the establishment of reasonable international control.

It is not we who want to hold things up. However, as you know, due to certain considerations, the Western Powers, and above all the U.S.A., are evading a solution of the disarmament problem. If the Western Powers are not ready to accept a maximum programme, then we have suggested a minimum programme, in the belief that it is very important to make a first step, in order that they to solve one problem after another, until finally that day

the peoples long for will be reached, the day when war as a means of solving international problems will be excluded.

We say: Let us act, let us impose a strict prohibition on atomic and hydrogen weapons, immediately cease testing these weapons and establish reasonable controls. Let us come to an agreement on conditions which do not trespass on the interests of the parties concerned, which do not strengthen some and weaken others, on conditions which would not lead to states losing their independence and sovereignty, whichever system they may belong to, and on conditions which would not offer advantages to some countries to the detriment of others.

The time is ripe and, before the opportunity is lost, the Soviet Union calls on the Western Powers. It is time to go over from words to deeds, we must act on the basis of equal rights, without dictation—not from a "position of strength," but from a position of reason.

It is well known that modern armaments and atomic and hydrogen bombs will be exceptionally dangerous in wartime not only for the two belligerent states in terms of outright devastation and destruction of human beings; they will also be deadly for states wishing to stand aside from military operations, since the poisoned soil, air, food, etc., will cause terrible torments and the slow annihilation of millions of people. There is in the world today an enormous quantity of atom and hydrogen bombs. According to the scientists' calculations, if they were all to be exploded simultaneously, the existence of almost every living thing on earth would be threatened.

Isn't it, therefore, time to think again, to end this duel of words, to eliminate the cold war, which was not begun by the peace-loving peoples; and turn to concrete negotiations in order, in a businesslike atmosphere, paying heed to each other's interests, patiently to advance step by step towards the solution of pressing urgent international problems, including that of disarmament? And for this there is no need for either the Soviet Union or the United States of America to renounce its own ideology.

From the letter to Bertrand Russell

Peaceful Co-existence or War

One need not be a scientist or military man to understand that another war—should any criminal force start it—would be calamity to all mankind. We share this planet with the capitalist countries, and it is better that there should be no war. We do not say this from weakness. We believe firmly that if there is a military conflict, the socialist system will win out, while the capitalist system will fail to survive the terrible ordeal. But Communists do not want their ideas to triumph at the price of tens of millions of human lives. The socialist countries do not wish to force their system on any nation.

We are deeply convinced that the advantages of socialism will unfold most effectively in peaceful competition with capitalism. The Soviet Union offers the capitalist countries to compete in raising living standards rather than in the arms race, in building dwellings and schools, rather than military bases and rocket ramps; in extending reciprocal trade and cultural exchanges rather than in the cold war.

In our time there is no other sensible policy but that of peaceful co-existence—a policy of reasonable compromise which does not place any country at an advantage and ensures the security of each state.

Today, the question stands thus: Either peaceful co-existence, or war.

From speech at the meeting in Budapest in celebration of the 13th Anniversary of Hungary's Liberation on April 3, 1958

The Disarmament Problem Is a Knotty One, But We Shall Not Lose Hope

The Soviet Union has made many constructive moves in the struggle to ease international tension. But so far we cannot be too hopeful, because the opposite side is twisting and turning all the time and is throwing up more and more new obstacles to the settlement of the paramount question of the present day—the problem of disarmament.

We have already taken the well-known decision to end unilaterally the testing of nuclear weapons and we have called on the United States and Britain to follow suit. But we are told: Control is needed. All well and good—we agreed. But we are again told in reply: "No, something more is still needed."

The matter is very simple. The Western Powers do not want to attain agreement and therefore seek to make such conditions as are impossible to carry out.

The question is utterly clear. The scientists of the entire world say that you cannot keep atomic and hydrogen explosions secret and that with existing technical means they are bound to be detected. Yet U. S. statesmen continued to claim that such explosions could be kept secret. However, they were forced by incontestable scientific information to admit that this could not be done. Now they again say that it is possible to carry out nuclear explosions in secret. As you see, they chop and change at every turn.

The disarmament problem is a knotty one. But we shall not lose hope. Our course in the struggle for peace, for disarmament, for a ban on nuclear weapons is crystal clear. All we have to say to the gentlemen who are against abolishing the cold war: We have plenty of patience. And it is of no avail to use pressure and intimidation in discussions with us. You will squeeze nothing out of us. We don't want war and we shall do everything to prevent it from breaking out. But we shall keep prepared for war.

From speech at the Moscow meeting on return of Party and Government Delegation of the U.S.S.R. from Hungarian People's Republic on April 10, 1958.

Soviet Union Is Ready at Any Time To Sign a Disarmament Agreement

If we were to enumerate all the Soviet proposals on disarmament, this enumeration would, in effect, be an indictment of the Western Powers, which, each time the Soviet Union has made a proposal meeting the Western position half-way, have sought various pretexts for not accepting it.

The Soviet Union is ready at any time to sign an agreement on banning atomic and hydrogen weapons and on disarmament. We are ready to conclude a comprehensive agreement and agreements on individual aspects of the disarmament problem. Yet neither of these two approaches suits the Western Powers. Even their own proposals do not suit them as soon as the Soviet Union agrees to them.

The Soviet Union is known to have proposed at one time the complete banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons, and end to their manufacture, their removal from national armaments and the liquidation of all

stockpiles of these weapons. Moreover, the Soviet Union's proposal provided for the implementation of these measures under corresponding effective and reasonable controls. However, this proposal did not meet with support from the Western Powers.

We have repeatedly proposed to the Western Powers that unilateral disarmament measures be taken, but they have refused to do this as well. Now we have offered them another opportunity to take a real step towards reaching a disarmament agreement and ensuring international security: to unilaterally end the tests of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The Soviet Union is known to have already taken this step. But we have run against a blank wall again. The two other powers possessing nuclear weapons—the United States and Britain—remain stubbornly opposed to this.

Nevertheless, we shall continue to be patient and persistent in our efforts to solve the disarmament problem and to achieve a ban on nuclear weapons. We believe that sooner or later the Western Powers will be compelled to agree to a solution of the disarmament problem because all the peoples want this and because it is the only way to save the world from the horrors of a new war.

From replies to questions put by Greek newspaper publisher Lambrakis.

Socialist Countries Do Not Need War

The governing circles of the imperialist powers aim their policy against peaceful co-existence. There are statesmen in the capitalist countries who deny the need of peaceful co-existence. But what does that mean? It means going to war. There is no other alternative.

We do not need war. The socialist countries are growing, rapidly developing countries. They are young, sound and strong, and the future inevitably belongs to the young, the growing. We need peace to build the new society. Our countries have all the requisites for it.

[Like a grievously sick man prepared to do anything to prolong his life, capitalism, too, fatally ill as it is, seeks salvation in such things as the armaments race, war preparations, hydrogen bombs, and military blocs, hoping thereby to checkrein the development of socialism and prolong its own existence.]

Certain in the triumph of socialism, certain that the future belongs to it, we resolutely oppose the cold war. Socialism does not need atomic or hydrogen bombs to assert itself. Like sound seed thrown on good earth, socialism is yielding abundant fruit. And this causes joy to millions of people all over the world.

Why are the imperialists reluctant to negotiate with us and reach an agreement? They fear that an agreement with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries would knock the bottom out of the imperialist propaganda about the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp wanting to conquer the whole world by force of arms.

If they acknowledge that the so-called "Communist danger" is non-existent, they will have to acknowledge the principle of peaceful co-existence of the two systems, and to accept the existence of the socialist countries. In that case the entire system of aggressive pacts which they built up—NATO, SEATO, the Baghdad Pact, etc.—will begin to crumble. The fable of a "Communist danger" is something like a main thread knitting together the system of military pacts. Speaking figuratively, that system is reminiscent of a knitted article. Pull a single thread out of it and it runs until it becomes a shapeless mass of thread.

ONE of the key issues now troubling world opinion is that of disarmament.

As before, the Soviet Union is consistently calling for decisive steps in that sphere. As you know, all our efforts have until now unfortunately failed to yield the desired results.

Western statesmen are resorting to a multitude of diverse manoeuvres to check disarmament, to lead it into a blind alley, and to torpedo it. What they like most is to talk about control. They seek to replace disarmament talk with talk about control and insist that control should precede disarmament. First control—then disarmament. First control—then easing international tension. First control—then mutual confidence. Such, in a nutshell, are their tactics.

But it is an absurd approach, because mutual control is an act of great trust. What does control mean? To permit one state to enforce all-round control within another means opening all one's doors to the other party, to admit its inspectors and controllers to places considered sacred by one's people.

In every church, at least in every Orthodox church, there is a spot in the altar which only a priest may tread. Others, even pious people, are not supposed to go there. Each country likewise has its altar, its sacred spots which it does not even show to all its friends, or shows to just its closest friends—those who have won its trust. I am deliberately using clerical terms here, because our Western partners like to refer to the Bible and to seek cover behind the Scriptures.

It would seem clear that we should first establish at least a modicum of mutual trust and then proceed gradually to control and inspection. That would be the natural approach while our partners are setting the question on

its head. No, they say, admit us first to your Communist altar, and with time we'll see whether or not you ought to be trusted, and whether or not it is worthwhile reducing armaments.

Is it possible in present international circumstances, when even a modicum of trust is lacking, to speak in earnest about installing all-around control and inspection as a first step? Those who put matters that way only reveal themselves in their true colours and show that they have no intention of speaking in earnest about disarmament, of confidence, or control.

If the attempt is made to establish control without confidence, it will not be control but an act of intelligence with the object of locating the adversary's vulnerable points for an aggression. Since we have no thought of aggression, we have no need of such "control."

We shall never relinquish the right to guard our security. Nor do we deny this legitimate right to others. That is why we say: Let us not begin with control, keep out of other countries' altars until you have first proved that you may be trusted, that you will not desecrate their sanctity and will not strive to violate the laws of the country which you want to inspect.

But when numerous politicians in the United States openly urge war against the Soviet Union, when they pronounce spiteful speeches against our country, and follow this up with proposals about inspecting Soviet territory, it sounds in effect, like a provocation.

We declare once again that the Soviet Union favours control and inspection. Our proposals about establishing control posts to prevent sudden attack, mainly on railway junctions, highways and ports, are well known. Furthermore, we have proposed air inspection 800 kilometres both sides of the line dividing our troops and Western troops in Germany and over a part of Soviet territory in the Far East and a corresponding part of U. S. territory. The Soviet Government has proposed that experts should work out practical measures to eliminate all possibilities of sudden attack.

As confidence gradually develops between states we shall be ready to agree to further measures of control. And as soon as there is complete trust between ourselves and the Western Powers, as soon as we see that nothing is being conspired against our country and against world peace, we shall be ready to open all doors and to show everything we have. But as long as these conditions are lacking, we do not intend, and have no right to intend, risking the security of the socialist countries.

From the speech at Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship meeting of Moscow working people, July 12, 1955.

Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons Is Only Way Out of Deadlock

The peoples are tired of the cold war. Fear of the possibility of a devastating war is preventing them from working normally. People cannot live in peace if their efforts are senselessly wasted on the production of instruments of annihilation. People are not secure as long as there is the possibility that imperialist provocateurs of some kind will risk starting war.

Is much required in the present tense conditions and with the existing suspicions, for the "accidental" appearance of a foreign plane, for a bomb "accidentally" dropped by it, to cause a military conflict which may turn into a general war?

Strange as it may seem, there are some persons in official positions in the United States and Britain who are trying to prove that flights of bombers carrying hydrogen bombs are necessary. The more planes with hydrogen weapons are flying in the air, the less the room that is left for the doves of peace and the more for the machinations of the demon of war.

The level of armaments in some countries is now at such a stage that a moment is evidently coming—perhaps it has already come—when these countries themselves, irrespective of whether an agreement on discontinuing the manufacture of atom and hydrogen bombs is reached or not, will have to say: "Enough!"

In the past obsolete weapons and military equipment were replaced as new models were developed, but today, evidently, a stage has been reached in which it is difficult to invent a more powerful weapon than the hydrogen bomb, since there are no limits to its power. It is not by chance that scientists—so far timidly, it is true—are expressing the opinion that if the accumulated stockpiles of nuclear weapons are exploded, this can poison the atmosphere of the entire world.

The appalling consequences of nuclear weapons for all mankind are realized not only by scientists but also by the broadest sections of the public, by hundreds of millions of ordinary people throughout the world.

They are increasingly demanding of the governments, and above all of the governments of the countries possessing nuclear weapons, that an end be put to the tests of these weapons. Common sense suggests to the people the only way out of the deadlock on the disarmament problem. And this way out lies in the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

We are obviously approaching a time when govern-

ments, if they want to retain their bonds with the people, will no longer be able to turn a deaf ear to this universal demand of our times, and, even if they do not reach an agreement among themselves, they will be compelled unilaterally to discontinue the production of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

*From speech at a meeting of
the electors of Kalinin constituency,
Moscow, on March 14, 1958.*

Let Us Stop Testing from Today!

Loyal to its policy of peace, the Soviet Union has lately made many new constructive proposals and taken a number of steps internationally designed to relieve tension, stop the armaments race, and prohibit nuclear weapons.

You know that a few days ago the Supreme Soviet of the USSR adopted the decision for our country to unilaterally discontinue experimental explosions of atomic and hydrogen weapons. The Supreme Soviet of the USSR had called on the United States and Britain to follow suit.

We urge our partners to stop testing! Let us, as from today, make no more explosions of hydrogen and atomic bombs, and stop contaminating the atmosphere with radioactive fall-out.

On behalf of the peoples of the Soviet Union, on behalf of the Soviet Government, I address myself to the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, to the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan. Follow the example set by the Soviet Union and thereby show your good will. It would make mankind happy. It would be a noble action that would live through the ages. We regard a stop to nuclear testing as a first step towards complete disarmament, towards creating conditions for lasting world peace, as a step towards peaceful co-existence, peaceful competition between the two systems. The settlement of this vitally important question would facilitate the solution also of other urgent international problems.

From speech at a mass meeting in Budapest during the stay of the Soviet Party and Government Delegation in Hungary, April 4, 1958.

We Stand Firmly for Peace

Our principal weapon is Marxism-Leninism. We shall defeat the capitalist world by using this powerful ideological weapon, rather than the hydrogen bomb. We produced the hydrogen bomb with the sole object of cooling the ambitions of some excessively zealous politicians and generals in the capitalist countries.

After all, living among wolves one must have the means to let them know how dangerous it is for them to show their fangs. We have no wish to attack anyone. But we do not want to be simpletons who can be taken barehanded. Now we cannot be taken with gloved hands, let alone barehanded!

The Soviet state, like all socialist countries, is a peaceful state. We adhere steadfastly to the Leninist principles of foreign policy. We stand firmly for peace, for the prohibition of atomic weapons, for disarmament. We are ready today to sign a treaty and end nuclear tests for a time, but this must be done in good faith, with our Western partners displaying as conscientious an attitude as we are towards solving this problem.

However, the ruling circles of the Western Powers, particularly the United States, do not agree to that. Everybody knows that the Soviet Government has unilaterally ended nuclear tests and urged the governments of the United States and Britain to follow suit. When we declared that we would do no more testing, they did not accept our proposal and stepped up their tests. Months went by, but the United States and Britain gave no thought to discontinuing tests of atomic and hydrogen bombs. Not to be at a disadvantage, in an unequal position, we had no other alternative but to resume our tests.

From the speech at Baltic Works meeting during stay in Leningrad of Polish People's Republic Delegation, Nov. 3, 1950

The Nuclear Arming of West Germany Is a Fatal Course

Those who advocate arming the Bundeswehr with nuclear and rocket weapons are trying to present matters as if the measures they are taking in this direction are necessary to protect the Federal Republic of Germany from some "threat" coming from the East, and as if they might ensure the security of the Federal Republic. It is not difficult to see that these allegations, to say the least, have nothing in common with the truth.

The talk about a "threat" from the Soviet Union is deception, and its purpose is to justify measures aimed at drawing the Federal Republic into the atomic and rocket race and to stir up hatred against the Soviet Union among the West German population.

The Soviet Union has never waged any aggressive wars—such wars are foreign to the very nature of our state. The USSR does not intend, and never has intended, to attack either the Federal Republic of Germany or any other state. The threat of "local attacks" on the Federal Republic by the Soviet Union, with which the Federal Republic's Defence Minister Strauss recently tried to scare the West German population, is an absurd fabrication invented to meet the needs of revenge seekers and militarists. West Germany as a state would undoubtedly stand to gain and would earn the confidence of neighbouring peoples if it called to order the ill-starred strategists in the Federal Republic who continue to slander peace-loving nations and foment revanchist passions among the German population.

The Soviet Government fully shares the opinion of West German circles who maintain that nuclear weapons cannot serve as a means of ensuring the security of the Federal Republic of Germany, and that arming the Bundeswehr with these weapons, and stationing these weapons on West German territory, threaten to destroy the Federal Republic of Germany and spell death for millions upon millions of Germans, since all these measures are pushing West Germany further and further along the road of war preparations.

Only politically blind and ignorant people can fail to see the horrible holocaust being prepared for the Federal Republic of Germany by those who are shaping the present military and political course of this state.

We get the impression that those who advocate the nuclear arming of the Federal Republic either do not realize to the full the danger to which they are exposing the West German population or are doing this deliberately.

In either case they are committing a crime by pushing the Federal Republic of Germany along a fatal course.

From replies to questions put by Hans Kempf, chief correspondent of Süddeutsche Zeitung, German Federal Republic

**Sunday: Part VI—The German Question:
2 States Exist**

jm

6

German Question 2 States Exist

Book Reviews

PHILADELPHIA DIVISION

Philadelphia, Pa.

The Philadelphia Inquirer XX
EDITOR: WALTER H. ANNENBERG

The Evening Bulletin
EDITOR: MELVILLE F. FERGUSON

Philadelphia Daily News
EDITOR: J. RAY HUNT

DATE 9/13/59

EDITION Sunday

PAGE 1

COLUMN 7-8

TITLE OF CASE SELECTED PORTIONS OF
"KHRUSHCHEV'S BLUEPRINT FOR FUTURE,"
FROM NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV'S BOOK,
"FOR VICTORY IN PEACEFUL COMPETITION
WITH CAPITALISM."

9-9-59
Philadelphia Inquirer
INITIALED

Routing Slip

62-46865-A
RECORDED
SEP 15 1959

'A Peace Treaty Is Fundamental To Settlement'

The Inquirer presents today the sixth part of selected portions of "Khrushchev's Blueprint for Future," from Nikita S. Khrushchev's first important book, "For Victory in Peaceful Competition with Capitalism," as a public service because it believes all Americans should know how the leader of the USSR thinks, what he believes and what his aims are. Publication in our columns does not in any way constitute approval or confirmation of his views. Copyright, 1959, The Philadelphia Inquirer (A Division of Triangle Publications, Inc.) and Nikita S. Khrushchev. All authorized republications must carry a complete copyright line as a prelude on each article.

Part Six

By NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV

NOW let us turn to the German question. As soon as the desirability of a summit conference is mentioned, the governing circles of certain Western Powers consider it necessary to push the so-called German question into the foreground and demand that precisely this issue be discussed by an international conference.

But what is the German question in present-day conditions? It is, above all, the question of relations between the two sovereign states with different social systems now existing on German soil. It is the problem of contact, rapprochement and unification in one form or another of the two states, with the aim of restoring the national unity of Germany as a single peaceful and democratic state.

The Soviet Union has more than once set out its views on this question, declaring that the German question can be solved only by the German people themselves. The Soviet Union, for its part, will do everything to help the reunification of Germany.

On what basis must such reunification be effected? I think that the Germans themselves will decide this matter. Obviously Herr Adenauer will not want the economy of West Germany to be rebuilt along socialist lines. It is also obvious that the working people of the German Democratic Republic will not want to abolish their socialist gains and will not agree to restore capitalism. Therefore it is necessary to recognize the historical fact that two states with different social systems exist in Germany—the socialist German Democratic Republic and the capitalist Federal Republic of Germany. With the aim of peacefully unifying the country, the Government of the German Democratic Republic has made a reasonable proposal first to create a German confederation, which would be a union by treaty of two sovereign states, in order to pursue a common policy on a definite range of external and internal questions.

From speech, "Some Aspects of International Situation" at conference of front-rank workers in agriculture of the Byelorussian Republic, Jan. 22, 1958

Peace Treaty Is Fundamental To Settlement of German Problem

We are aware that the problem of a peace treaty profoundly agitates the minds of Germans. And that is understandable. More than 12 years have elapsed since the end of the Second World War, but the German people are still without a peace treaty which would write finis to the war and its consequences. The problem of a peace treaty is the problem of restoring Germany's complete sovereignty and independence, the problem of its frontiers and of the withdrawal of foreign troops from its territory. It is therefore natural that no ersatz agreements, such as the Paris Agreements, can take the place of a peace treaty. Such decisions can only be of a transitory nature, because they do not spring from the national interests of the two German states and are in direct conflict with the interests of the security of a number of states, above all, those that took part in the war against Hitler Germany.

But it is one thing to end the state of war with Germany, which has also been done by the Soviet Government in view of the Western Powers' opposition to the conclu-

tion of a peace treaty with Germany, and another to conclude a peace treaty, which defines the external conditions, through the observation of which Germany's entire development could be protected from every kind of extraneous interference. During the entire postwar period the Soviet Government has been working for a fundamental settlement of the German problem through the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.

Bearing in mind that there are two sovereign states in Germany today—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany—it is important not to postpone the drawing up of a draft peace treaty, in order to give the German people a clear idea of Germany's prospects for future development.

Needless to say, the Germans themselves—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany—must take part in the drawing up of such a draft treaty. And here again, in my opinion, it is the proposal of the Government of the German Democratic Republic to set up a German confederation that offers the most realistic possibilities for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.

In that event, a peace treaty could be concluded both with the organs of the confederation and with the governments of the states within that confederation.

We believe that both German states must unconditionally renounce all kinds of weapons of mass destruction, that is to say, renounce both their own production of atomic, hydrogen and rocket weapons and also the equipping of their armed forces with foreign-made weapons of this kind, and prevent the building of atomic and rocket bases belonging to other powers on their territory. Both German states, after embarking on the road of re-establishing national unity, must renounce membership of the military groupings of the Powers to which they belong at the present time.

And lastly, the levels of the armed forces of the two German states must be established in conformity with their requirements for self-defense and for ensuring internal security, through an agreement between the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Indeed, the present situation in Berlin cannot be regarded as normal. Berlin is, of course, the capital of the German Democratic Republic, while the western part of the city, namely, the American, British and French sectors, represent a kind of island within the German Democratic Republic.

The military authorities of the Western Powers in Berlin in every way stress their prerogatives as occupation authorities. Whereas in West Germany some of the restrictions of the occupation regime which affect the Germans must have been lifted; in West Berlin these restrictions are still in force.

It is also well known that West Berlin is being extensively used for subversive activities against the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries. I must say frankly that as a result of the policy of the United States, Britain and France, and also of the Federal Republic of Germany, West Berlin has become one of the most painful sores of the cold war.

From interview accorded West German publisher Alex Springer, editor of Die Welt, Jan. 29, 1958.

European Security Must Be Ensured

I also want to make a few remarks about the so-called German question. At one time we made persistent efforts to settle this question in complete conformity with the Crimean and Potsdam declarations. It is not our fault that this was not achieved. The Western Powers were interested in reviving German militarism instead of creating a united, democratic and peaceful Germany.

The situation has radically changed since then. Two sovereign German states have been formed and they themselves have to find the way to a rapprochement. We maintain normal diplomatic relations with these two states—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany—and we refuse to interfere in their internal affairs.

If there is really a desire to do something useful in this sphere, the question of concluding a peace treaty with Germany should be discussed. If the Western Powers are against that, we shall not insist on including it in the agenda. But we cannot agree to the fact that some people tie up European security with the German question, as is done in the State Department's aide-memoire. Such a tie-up had its history, but those days are gone.

The main thing now is to ensure European security. But a solution to this important problem in the way proposed by the United States and some other Western countries will by no means strengthen peace in Europe, and, consequently, will not strengthen world peace either. Need it be said that this will bring neither a more stable peace nor security to the Germans, whether in West Germany or in East Germany.

The German problem is an important one for the German nation. But we must proceed from the interests of ensuring the security of all the European peoples, including the German people. Let us, therefore, begin by settling the problem which concerns all Europe and the entire world, and this will facilitate the solution of the German problem as well.

When Europe stops being a theatre for military com-

petition between the two blocs; when foreign troops go back home, when the threat of war is eliminated, that is to say, when European security is ensured and tension has been eased, all the peoples of Europe, and for that matter not only of Europe, will only gain by that. Would not all this help the German people, who now live in two states with different social conditions, to find a way to contact, to rapprochement and to the solution of the issues that cause anxiety to the populations of both those states? Any other way will lead, not to the solution of the German question, but to a worsening of the situation and even to war.

From speech at a meeting of the electors of Kalinin Constituency, Moscow, March 14, 1958.

Why the Soviet Union Suggests the Ending of the Occupation of West Berlin

Why the question of ending the occupation status of Berlin has arisen, and why it has become necessary to settle this question at this particular time? This is explained by the particular relations which have developed between the Great Powers or, as the press would say, between the West and the East.

We have taken many steps towards relieving the tension in international relations, paving the way for a *entente*, developing normal relations between states, assuring peaceful co-existence and solving whatever differences may arise by peaceful means, without allowing matters to lead to conflict.

We have undertaken no few measures to find methods of approach to this problem, that is to say, towards the establishment of a normal situation throughout the world and, above all, in Europe, towards assuring understanding and peace among the states which fought against Nazi Germany. And enough time—more than 13 years—has elapsed since the war.

The obstacle to the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany; that accounts for the attitude of representatives of the Western Powers and the particular persistence of West Germany, consists in their unwillingness to recognize the realities of life. And the actual reality is that there are two German states in existence—the Federal Republic of Germany, which bases itself on the principle of private capitalist ownership, and the German Democratic Republic, which is growing and developing on a socialist basis and moving in the direction of socialism.

If we accept this reasoning which is often regarded in the West as valid, then it is necessary to perpetuate this situation. Indeed, the German Democratic Republic would hardly be able to persuade Herr Adenauer and his Government that West Germany should adopt a socialist trend in its political activity. That would, of course, be desirable both for the Germans of the German Democratic Republic and for many of the Germans in West Germany, as well as for all progressive mankind, and we, as Communists, would welcome this very much.

But to think that Herr Adenauer and the ruling circles of West Germany will agree to it would mean indulging in wishful thinking.

ON THE other hand, certain circles in West Germany and, to my regret, Chancellor Adenauer and others, do indulge in this sort of wishful thinking, as they are hoping, for some reason or other, to get the German

Democratic Republic to renounce its socialist system and to adopt a capitalist system. This, they say, would be the basis for the "reunification" of Germany, that is to say, for the monopoly circles of West Germany to absorb the German Democratic Republic and thus create a united Germany on the same social basis prevailing in West Germany. And only after this will it become possible, in their opinion, to conclude a peace treaty.

Are these hopes realistic? Of course not. They must be described as fantastic, since the working people of the German Democratic Republic will never agree to give up their social and political gains in favour of exploiters and monopolists.

So what is to be done?

One must proceed from the real facts. There exists a divided Berlin where the occupation regime is still maintained. The war was ended more than 13 years ago. I feel that every normal person finds such a situation abnormal. It is necessary, therefore, to find a solution that will end this abnormality, because the present existence of the occupation regime serves no positive purpose at all. The perpetuation of such a situation would be to the advantage only of a party pursuing aggressive aims.

To the Western Powers West Berlin is a convenient place for conducting an aggressive policy against the German Democratic Republic, and against the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist camp. In view of a definite policy of the Western Powers to whip up revengeful sentiments in West Germany and to encourage the revival of reactionary fascist organizations and forces there, West Berlin has been turned into a kind of cancerous tumor. And if it is not eliminated this threatens to become a danger that may lead to quite undesirable consequences.

It is precisely because of this threat that we have decided to perform a surgical operation, i.e., to terminate the occupation status of Berlin and to create conditions that will help to normalize relations between the Great Powers of the former anti-Hitler coalition. We wish to establish a normal atmosphere, normal conditions, in which the relations between our countries will become what they were during the war against Hitler Germany.

We are convinced that all peoples who stand for ending the cold war, for establishing normal conditions in the mutual relations between countries, for ensuring the peaceful co-existence of countries, irrespective of their systems and for ruling out friction and conflicts between countries—all these people will welcome the Soviet Union's proposals for the solution of the Berlin problem.

At the same time, we realize perfectly well that certain circles who are in favour of continuing the cold war, stand for utilizing West Berlin as a hotbed of discord for kindling a hot war. These circles will naturally be displeased with our peace proposals and will oppose them.

But we are convinced that such people constitute a minority in the world. The overwhelming majority of people want peace in the world and therefore we count on the support of these people.

From press conference in Kremlin held by N. S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, Nov. 27, 1958.

Adenauer's Policy May Lead to the Collapse of West Germany

If the Federal Chancellor were, really concerned

about the restoration of the country's unity would he then emerge as the leader of a campaign for continuing the occupation of West Berlin indefinitely? Why is he doing this? In any case, it is not being done in the interests of the West Berlin population, who have to put up with the occupation régime. Nor is it being done, of course, in the interests of a detente and the establishment of normal relations between neighbouring countries.

Or let us take the question of a peace treaty with Germany. It is indeed unbelievable that the head of the government of one of the existing German states does not want to conclude a peace treaty through negotiations with the Soviet Union and the three Western Powers—the leading participants in the anti-Hitler coalition—and with the participation of the two sovereign German states which have emerged on the territory of Germany.

Chancellor Adenauer, like his NATO partners, is apparently striving for some other peace treaty which would actually abolish the German Democratic Republic. But no sober-minded person can expect this to be accepted. What grounds are there for raising the question of abolishing the German Democratic Republic—the first workers' and peasants' state in the history of Germany? For that matter, the Germans in the German Democratic Republic could suggest the abolition of the Federal Republic of Germany and reunify the country on the basis of the socialist principles on which the German Democratic Republic is based. But it is obvious that neither of these two approaches to the question is realistic.

The only practical possibility of solving the German question once and for all is through a peaceful settlement with Germany. In concluding a peace treaty with Germany, the existence of the two German states must undoubtedly be taken into consideration and they must be invited to take part in the negotiations of the four Great Powers. This would be the most reasonable solution to the problem and would be welcomed by the people of all countries, who yearn for the relaxation of tension and for peace to be secured.

But if the Federal Chancellor insists on something else, it signifies that he is pursuing other aims but not those which guarantee peace. It means that he is pursuing a dangerous "positions of strength" policy.

He wishes to create an army and to arm it with atomic weapons; he wishes to pursue a policy of force. Thus it follows that Chancellor Adenauer is pursuing a policy which may lead to disaster, to the collapse of West Germany, since under present conditions, with the existence of modern weapons of mass destruction, war would be of a devastating nature. This is monstrous, of course, but it is a fact, and we must not shut our eyes to it. We would like to believe that the sound patriotic forces which exist in West Germany and are concerned for the destiny of their people, will correctly understand this in good time and do everything in their power to prevent the unleashing of a third world war.

*From replies to questions put by Hans Kempfski,
Chief Correspondent of Süddeutsche Zeitung, Ger-
man Federal Republic*

**Monday: Part VII—'One Vital
Question: War or Peace'**

gm
One Vital

Question:

War or

Peace?

Book Reviews

PHILADELPHIA DIVISION

Philadelphia, Pa.

The Philadelphia Inquirer XX
EDITOR: WALTER H. ANNENBERG

The Evening Bulletin
EDITOR: MELVILLE F. FERGUSON

Philadelphia Daily News
EDITOR: J. RAY HUNT

DATE 9/14/59

EDITION Late Star

PAGE 1

COLUMN 7-8

TITLE OF CASE SELECTED PORTIONS OF
"KHRUSHCHEV'S BLUEPRINT FOR FUTURE,"
FROM NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV'S BOOK,
"FOR VICTORY IN PEACEFUL COMPETITION
WITH CAPITALISM."

TOP CLIPPING

DATED 9-9-59

FROM Philadelphia Enquirer

MARKED FILE AND INITIALED

Routing Slip

62-46855-A
NOT RECORDED
47 DEC 8 1959

Future Conflict Can Bring About End of All Life'

The Inquirer presents today the seventh and last part of selected portions of "Khrushchev's Blueprint for Future," from Nikita S. Khrushchev's first important book, "For Victory in Peaceful Competition with Capitalism," as a public service because it believes all Americans should know how the leader of the USSR thinks, what he believes and what his aims are. Publication in our columns does not in any way constitute approval or confirmation of his views. Copyright 1959, The Philadelphia Inquirer (A Division of Triangle Publications, Inc.) and Nikita S. Khrushchev. All authorized republications must carry a complete copyright line as it precedes on each article.

Seventh and Last Part

By NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV

THE most burning, vital question for all mankind today is the question of peace or war. Wars between states have always caused many casualties and much destruction. But a future war, if contrary to the will of the peoples, it is unleashed, threatens to be the most destructive of all wars—a nuclear war. Apart from direct destruction, the use of nuclear weapons will contaminate the air by radioactive fall-out, and this can lead to the destruction of all life, especially in countries with densely-populated, small territories. There, literally everything can be swept from the face of the Earth.

It is precisely for this reason that in our day the struggle to preserve peace and prevent a new war has become not only the primary, vital concern of those who may be subjected to attack by the imperialists, but also the immediate concern of the peoples of all countries, regardless of where they may live—in Europe or Asia, America or Africa, irrespective of their class position, religious beliefs or the colour of their skin—it is literally the concern of everyone living on Earth.

The task is to prevent a new war and to ensure peace throughout the world. But this needs more than just appeals, more than the desire alone. Peace must be defended in stubborn struggle against the forces that are trying to unleash a new war.

To live, without wars, without fear for the morrow, without slavery and poverty, free from the exploitation of some countries by others, free from social injustices—that is what the best minds of mankind and the working people of the whole world have dreamed of for centuries. But only today can these noble dreams become clothed with reality. This has become possible as a result of the strengthened might of the Soviet Union and the entire world socialist system, that have inaugurated a new epoch in the history of mankind—the epoch of real socialist freedom and the triumph of reason.

Today the decisive requirement for mankind's advance along the path of progress is peace, the prevention of those terrible disasters that a new war would bring.

The Communist Party and the Soviet Government, for whom there is nothing greater than the fulfillment of the aspirations of the people, have done, and are doing, everything necessary to prevent a new war and to direct the development of international relations along the lines of preserving a stable peace. They are doing everything possible to achieve peace and equitable relations and friendship among all peoples in deeds and not in words.

From speech at a meeting of the electors of Kalinin constituency, Moscow, March 14, 1953.

To Rise Above Ideological Differences

The Soviet Union works untiringly for universal disarmament, for the unconditional banning of nuclear weapons, for an immediate discontinuation of atomic and

hydrogen bomb tests, for ending the cold war. As part of its peace policy, working for an international detente and an atmosphere of confidence, the Soviet Government has in the last three years reduced the country's armed forces by 2,140,000 men.

You know that a few days ago the first session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR has decided upon the unilateral discontinuation by the Soviet Union of tests of all types of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

The Soviet Union has applied, and will continue to apply, every effort to achieve mutual understanding and friendly relations with the peoples of all countries. We act upon the assumption that in present circumstances all governments which appreciate their responsibility for world destinies, must rise above ideological differences. In the past three or four years we have achieved some positive results in that respect.

Regrettably, leading statesmen in a number of Western countries have not as yet shown any desire to adopt the principles of co-existence, non-aggression, mutual respect of territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-interference in domestic affairs, and rejection of the policy "from strength." They take no heed of the people's hatred of cold war, of their urge for peace and action to relieve international tension.

The Soviet Union threatens no one. It has always opposed war as an instrument of international politics. It is against carving the world up into military blocs. It stands for settling international issues by negotiation. This is precisely why the Soviet Government has approached the governments of the Great Powers and the governments of most countries of the world, with the proposal of convening a summit conference.

From speech at the meeting in Budapest in celebration of 13th anniversary of Hungary's liberation, on April 3, 1958.

Let People See and Decide

Yes, we are convinced that our ideas will triumph. But the victory of these ideas will not be won by war but by a higher standard of living under socialism and a higher level of culture, science and art, of everything required for the life and not for the death of man. Hydrogen bombs

and rockets are powerless against this; neither Atlantic nor Baghdad pacts can hinder dissemination of the idea of scientific communism, because the logic of life is inculcating them in the minds and hearts of men.

When everyone sees that people in socialist countries live well, enjoy equal rights, have good housing—and we have now set ourselves the task of solving the housing problem within the next 10-12 years—that they are well fed and have the shortest working day because they are the owners of their plants and factories and no one exploits them; when people see that science develops faster and more successfully in these countries, that everyone who wishes can obtain higher education and finds application for his abilities in any sphere of mental or physical labour; that people enjoy every material benefit; when they see that as a result of the higher productivity of labour and the shorter working day man will have increasingly more free time to develop his talents and abilities and to take up the arts according to his inclination, then only an idiot, pardon the word, will oppose this.

This is the basis of our confidence and conviction in the inevitable triumph of Communism. All people will inevitably come to this, but it is hard to say when. It is a long path and one must not advance towards Communism by sowing death. On the contrary, Communism is the most humane and the most philanthropic ideology. If the triumph of Communism were to be gained by aggressive wars and the extermination of people, in that case I personally would oppose Communism.

When all the peoples, or most of them, reach Communism there will be some kind of distribution of labour and duties among the peoples. This will not be competition but friendly cooperation and a rational distribution of forces, so as to produce, with the minimum expenditure, more goods to satisfy the vital needs of society and man. That is our ideal and purpose. Is war between nations necessary to achieve this aim?

We Need No Arms Race

Some bourgeois politicians plan to impose a still more acute cold war on the Soviet Union, thereby make it spend more on armaments, and in this way weaken its economic potential and impede its development along peaceful lines. Despite the cold war policy, however, our country's rate of economic development greatly exceeds that of capitalist

countries and will continue to exceed it. This is convincingly shown by the facts.

The time is not far off when we shall overtake the most advanced capitalist countries and outstrip them in per capita output. Everything now points to this, and when it has been achieved the indisputable superiority of the socialist system will be even more obvious to everyone.

Consequently, proceeding from the actual state of affairs and forecasts for the future, the Soviet Union is not interested in the arms race and the continuation of the cold war policy. We are for ending the cold war policy, for the establishment of the most sincere and friendly relations with all countries, for complete disarmament and the abolition of armed forces. But this, apparently, is something our partners are not yet prepared to do.

From interview given to A. McDonald, foreign editor of The London Times, on Jan. 31, 1958.

Man Is a Friend to Man

The main thing to be borne in mind is the noble aims and principles of Communism. Under capitalism man is a wolf to man. Every capitalist wants to snatch more for himself, caring nothing about the interests of other people or the interests of society, and he spies upon his neighbour in order to steal his secret and use it for his own ends. Such are the laws of capitalist competition.

Nothing like this exists under socialism. Under socialism there are no oppressors or oppressed; all men and women live by their own labour, and all have equal rights and duties to society. At the highest stage, under Communism, the full satisfaction of man's needs will be ensured. And these are not idle words. Under socialism man is a friend to man, regardless of the language he speaks and the God to whom he prays. Religion is matter for each person to decide for himself.

Socialism is the most just and noble social system, under which the efforts of the whole of society are aimed at promoting the welfare of the people and the constant development of the economy, science, culture and art, at ensuring that the people live better and better. It is well worth working for these lofty aims, sparing neither effort nor knowledge. In the language of Western businessmen, one can figuratively describe the firm of Communist construction as sound and upright.

Under socialism the products of labour are distributed in accordance with the quantity and quality of work contributed by each member of society, i.e., accord-

ing to the principle: From each according to his ability, to each according to his work. Under Communism distribution will take place according to the principle: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.

In order to speed the advance of all the socialist countries to Communism, we must do everything possible for each socialist country to develop its economy and increase its labour productivity more rapidly. Each of our countries must render genuinely fraternal aid to the other socialist countries. By uniting our efforts, by promoting cooperation and collaboration, our countries are achieving greater successes in economic development. At the same time each socialist country must make the best possible use of its internal potentialities for developing its national economy.

In the process of building Communism, all socialist countries will equalize their economies, eliminate differences in level of development, without taking the relatively underdeveloped countries as their criterion. This equalization will not take place by lowering the level of the countries that are economically highly developed. By no means. The equalization should and will proceed through the more rapid advance of the countries that are relatively less developed economically by bringing them up to the level of the most developed countries. Thus, all the socialist countries will march in a common united front along the road of socialism, along the road of building communist society.

From speech at a meeting held in Palace of Culture of the Bitterfeld Electro-Chemical Works during stay in German Democratic Republic of the delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 5th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, July 9, 1958

We Resolutely Oppose the Cold War

Certain in the triumph of socialism, certain that the future belongs to it, we resolutely oppose the cold war. Socialism does not need atomic or hydrogen bombs to assert itself. Like sound seed thrown on good earth, socialism is yielding abundant fruit. And this causes joy to millions of people all over the world.

From speech at Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship meeting of Moscow working people, July 12, 1958

THE END

Tolson _____
 Belmont _____
 DeLoach ☒ _____
 McGuire _____
 Mohr _____
 Parsons _____
 Rosen _____
 Tamm _____
 Trotter _____
 W.C. Sullivan _____
 Tele. Room _____
 Gandy _____

The Visit Became a Career

ONLY HUMAN: By SIDNEY FIELDS

Allen Stuart Drury arrived in Washington, D. C., at the age of 25, to visit relatives and perhaps get a year's experience as a reporter on the national scene before he returned to newspapering in California.

That was 16 years ago.

Had he returned to California we would not have had his novel, "Advise and Consent," a completely absorbing story of Washington politics and politicians, their greatness as well as their greed. It has given me a new knowledge and respect for our government.

It's Drury's first novel. It was a Book-of-the-Month selection, a Reader's Digest book condensation, and will be dramatized and filmed in a deal reported as a \$200,000 down payment against a \$450,000 top (not counting the taxes.)

The play, to be produced by Bob Fryer and Lawrence Carr, is now being dramatized by Loring Mandel for production next October. Otto Preminger will film it. Movies aren't always tender with a novel.

In which case I can call on the entire Washington press corps to help them make it authentic," said Drury, who stands six feet three and a quarter

inches, and has an affable, quiet directness.

FOR THE PAST five years he was a member of the N. Y. Times' Washington staff, but resigned, and after January 1, will work for the Reader's Digest in the capital. Before then he will take a holiday in Florida with his parents, his sister and her husband, and their two sons.

"Do you want to see my nephews?" he asked, and pulled their pictures out of his wallet. Two beautiful boys, five and two. Drury is a bachelor.

His father, now semi-retired and the Southern representative for "The Produce News," was a member of the Fruit Exchange in California. He got his first taste for politics from his mother, who was the State Legislative Representative for the PTA in Sacramento. *Approved 1958*

Born in Houston, Texas, but raised in Porterville, Calif., from the age of six months, Drury wrote short stories and poetry in high school and college, even had a poem published in a regional quarterly.

"But I never got anywhere, so I became a newspaperman,"

he said, "though I always knew I'd write novels."

At Stanford he worked on the University daily, and broke his back in an auto accident. One vertebra is still where it shouldn't be.

AFTER FOUR years on a weekly and a daily he resigned to volunteer for the army, despite his back. He was discharged after 14 months, and went to Washington. He worked for the U.P. Pathfinder magazine, and the Washington "Star" before the N. Y. Times.

"And at one point tried to write for a string of papers on my own," he said, "but that fizzled out."

In 1950 he wrote the first few chapters of "Advise and Consent," and like most newspapermen told himself: "I'll get around to it." All he did was make occasional notes.

Seven years later a friend, Evelyn Metzger, scouting for Doubleday, the publishers, read the chapters, got Drury to the chief editor, who asked for an outline, and showed a contract before him. He didn't sign, but went back to write the first section. When the editor read it he offered the contract again.

"And this time I signed," Drury said, "I had a deadline, and had to finish it."

He wrote steadily for 13 months, every week-end, on

file
AD
Allen Stuart Drury
Va.

The Washington Post and Times Herald _____
 The Washington Daily News _____
 The Evening Star _____
 New York Herald Tribune _____
 New York Journal-American _____
 New York Mirror 8 _____
 New York Daily News _____
 New York Post _____
 The New York Times _____
 The Worker _____
 The New Leader _____
 The Wall Street Journal _____
 Date _____

Advise And Consent
(Book By Allen Stuart Drury)

REC-19 62-46855-A

NOT RECORDED
 47 DEC 10 1959

DEC 8 1959

62 DEC 11 1959



ALLEN DRURY: CAPITAL GAINS

mornings before he went to work, setting himself a discipline of 4,000 to 5,000 words a week. Once, snowed in for four days, he finished 40 pages.

"I was blessed with the ability to write anywhere, any time, and under any circumstances," he said. And being a newspaperman helped.

HE WROTE in the modern two-bed-room house he had built along the Potomac five years ago, on property he bought ten years ago because he always wanted to live away from Washington and in a beautiful spot.

"Want to see a picture of it?" he asked, and pulled one out of his wallet. "Its beauty and all the river traffic are a distraction to writing."

He has a contract for two more novels, is now busy on the next one. "I have a few extra chapters lying around that I began years ago," he said.

And how has the sudden deluge of success affected him?

"I should be able to weather it with reasonable stability, sane good humor, and a calm refusal to be overly impressed with my own importance."